

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

ORAL HISTORY, 1973-74

Interviewee: Twelve members of the University of Nevada, Reno, community

Interviewed: 1973-1974

Published: 1974

Interviewer: Ruth G. Hilts

UNOHP Catalog #062

Description

Twelve university leaders were interviewed in the fourth volume of this joint project conducted by the Oral History Program and University Archives. Those interviewed were: Larry D. Struve, president, Alumni Association; Professor Gerald W. Petersen, president, American Association of University Professors; Terry Reynolds, president, Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN); Harold Jacobsen, chairman, Board of Regents; James T. Richardson, president, National Society of Professors; Don Driggs, chairman, Presidential Search Committee; Martin Dickstein, chairman, Public Occasions Board; Kelsie Harder, editor, Sagebrush; Sam Basta, chairman, University of Nevada Centennial Committee; James W. Hulse, author, *University of Nevada: A Centennial History*; Anne Howard, chairman, Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Board.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
ORAL HISTORY, 1973-74

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
ORAL HISTORY, 1973-74

An Oral History Conducted by Ruth G. Hilts

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1974
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1974.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Alumni Association <i>Larry D. Struve, President</i>	1
2. American Association of University Professors <i>Professor Gerald W. Petersen, President</i>	25
3. Associated Students of the University of Nevada <i>Terry Reynolds, President</i>	39
4. Board of Regents <i>Harold Jacobsen, Chairman</i>	69
5. National Society of Professors <i>James T. Richardson, President</i>	85
6. Presidential Search Committee <i>Don Driggs, Chairman</i>	97
7. Public Occasions Board <i>Martin Dickstein, Chairman</i>	135

8. <i>Sagebrush</i> <i>Kelsie Harder, Editor</i>	143
9. University of Nevada Centennial Committee <i>Sam Basta, Chairman</i>	171
10. University of Nevada: A Centennial History <i>James W. Hulse, Author</i>	187
11. Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Board <i>Anne Howard, Chairman</i>	199
Original Index: For Reference Only	209

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

This is the fourth volume of *the University of Nevada, Oral History*, a joint undertaking of the Oral History Project and the University Archives. Twelve members of the University community, outstanding by virtue of their leadership of boards, committees, campus organizations, student government, and the alumni association, were invited to contribute their comments on goals and achievements during their past year in office and their views on issues of interest to the University as a whole. The Faculty Senate chairman did not return the draft transcript, leaving eleven completed interviews.

The comments on his past several years' work by the author of *The University of Nevada: A Centennial History* are especially interesting. He has recounted how the book came to be written and some of his work methods and philosophy. The interview with the editor of this year's award-winning *Sagebrush* speaks of a new and vital approach to the production of the campus newspaper. For the first time, the story of an important contribution to community-campus rapprochement through

the presentation of concerts and recitals is told by the chairman of the long-standing public occasions board. In a valedictory interview, the retiring chairman of the Board of Regents reviews the year's problems and achievements, placing the Reno campus in perspective as a part, albeit the original part, of the Nevada system of higher education, as he has for the past four years. The chairman of the presidential selection committee contributed an intensely interesting history of the choosing of the University's new president, Max Milam. Comments by the ASUN president, one of the student representatives on the selection committee, illustrate the sense of responsibility of student leaders to this University.

Those persons who were invited to participate in this program of interviews responded graciously. The length of the tape-recorded interview sessions was determined solely by the interviewee's available time and desire to discuss the year's events. Their remarks were transcribed verbatim, edited for ease of reading, and returned to the authors

for their approval and minor corrections. It is the Oral History Project's goal to preserve, as well as possible on the printed page, the *oral* quality of the interviews; therefore, when submitting scripts for the author's review, it was asked that they not be changed for literary correctness.

That was a quiet year, a year of anticipation: the Centennial celebration begins this fall, and the new president begins his term in August. *Quiet* does not suggest *unproductive* as the interviews in this volume will attest. *Quiet* does suggest an orderly going about the business of the University during the last year of its first one hundred.

Ruth G. Hilts, Interviewer
University of Nevada, Reno
1974

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION: *LARRY D. STRUVE, PRESIDENT*

Larry D. Struve: My name is Larry D. Struve. I'm currently president of the University of Nevada Alumni Association on the Reno campus. I've been asked to give some observations about my role as President of the Alumni Association during the 1973-74 school year. And prior to coming here, I attempted to organize in my own mind what significant achievements we hoped to accomplish during this year. And in connection with formulating my thoughts, I uncovered the original script of my welcoming address to the Alumni Association which I presented to the Executive Committee and Association at the Homecoming breakfast on October 27, 1973. And I would like the record to incorporate this address as part of my remarks, because the purpose of this address was to lay out for the alumni what I hoped we would accomplish this year. And I think the written words more or less speak for themselves. [See end of chapter.]

To summarize how I viewed the accomplishments of this year aside from this

address, I think they fall into four areas. One, I was charged with responsibility this year of reorganizing, or carrying out a reorganization of the Alumni Association, to accommodate the change in by-laws

which were adopted just prior to my assuming the office of President and which will go into effect On October 1 of 1974. Essentially, this change in organization is to establish an Administrative Board within the Alumni Association which will handle all ministerial and administrative duties for the Association and will provide the organizational structure to organize the activities of the Alumni Association on a year-to-year basis.

This is significant in that, in the past, we have operated from an Executive Committee which has had in excess of 100 persons who are elected every year. In fact, this year, I believe the number of the Executive Committee is almost 160. People on the Executive Committee come from all over the United States, but most of them are from the Reno-Sparks-Carson City area. This Executive Committee meets once a month during the

school year. There are various sub-committees within the Executive Committee, including a nominations or a nominating committee. And traditionally, prior to this reorganization, the nominating committee has suggested a slate of candidates for the offices of president, first and second vice president, secretary and treasurer, which were submitted to the membership of the Alumni Association at the Homecoming breakfast. And as one would expect, this slate, which never had more than one person for any one office, was automatically elected.

Within the past three years, there's been growing dissatisfaction within the Alumni Association concerning this organization. It was felt by many that this did not air enough viewpoints about how the Alumni Association should be organized and what it should be doing, and who should be speaking for the alumni of the University. And therefore, it was felt that what was needed was a more meaningful election of the officers and leadership of the Association. There was quite a debate; I think it commenced in late 1971, and it culminated in the amendment to the by-laws in September of 1973.

What occurred was a compromise, and the compromise was that an Administrative Board would be elected prior to Homecoming of each year. And the Board would be composed of nine persons. The nine persons had to be members of the Executive Committee at the time of their election. And when they were elected they would serve terms of three years. The procedure of electing officers was completely changed, so that now there is no longer a slate of officers submitted at the Homecoming breakfast. Instead, the Administrative Board is elected by a mail ballot, which is sent out to the hundred and fifty or sixty members of the Executive Committee, whatever it

is, giving a list of those candidates running for the Administrative Board. Each person will have a short statement about what he hopes to accomplish as a member of the Administrative Board, or what he hopes the Alumni Association will get involved in if he is elected as an Administrative Board member.

And then at Homecoming, these mail ballots, which are sent in by the members of the Exec Committee are canvassed, and the results are announced at the Homecoming breakfast. After the Administrative Board is elected in this manner, the officers of the Association and the chairmen of the important committees will be elected by the Administrative Board, from the elected members of the Administrative Board. And this will occur either at a special meeting shortly after the Homecoming breakfast or at a time mutually agreeable to the members of the Administrative Board. The terms of office of the officers of the Association will now run on the calendar year, January 1 to December 31, which has been changed from the preceding set-up, which was to hold office from their election at the Homecoming breakfast to the following Homecoming. This change will enable the new leadership and the new members of the Administrative Board to become informed of ongoing programs and will give them a chance to get their feet on the ground before they assume the duties of office on January 1 of each year.

Now, my job this year was to make the transition from the old to the new. And I have appointed a Nominations and Elections Committee composed of nine persons to carry out the change in the by-laws. The Chairman of this Committee is last year's alumni President, Paul Havas. The Vice Chairman of that committee is Keith Lee, who has been a member of the Executive Committee for the past few years; he's a

former student body president, and also was the draftsman of the change in the by-laws that are now being implemented. Also on the committee are Cecelia St. John, who is a member of the staff at the University of Nevada and a very active member in our Alumni Association; Judy Nash, who is First Vice President of the Alumni Association, and was our representative on the Presidential Search Committee; Tom Brasfield, who is a new member on the Executive Committee, a graduate in the late 1960's, and a very active young graduate in the Alumni Association; Laurie Albright, who is a 1973 graduate of the University, who I placed on this Committee to help us in getting names of potentially young alumni to give us the benefit of newer ideas, and maybe some different ideas, about how we can evolve under this new organization. To represent the older alumni, I have appointed Hans Wolfe, who was the recipient last year of the Outstanding Alumni Award; he also is a former student body president, a graduate in 1947, and an extremely active member in the Executive Committee this year. Beverly Hudson, who works in the College of the State Judiciary, also a recipient of the Outstanding Alumni Award, and who graduated in the 1950's. Joe Melcher is the ninth representative. Joe is a graduate in the 1950's, has been very active in alumni publications, and has served in years past on the nominating committee. And as a result, I think that I have a balance of ages and backgrounds and philosophies on this Nominations and Elections Committee. And I am confident that they will help us make this transition.

In addition to reorganizing the administrative structure, we still have to continue to elect our Executive Committee. Under the new by-laws, the Executive Committee is the ultimate policy-making body of the Alumni Association. And

the requirements for being active on that Committee are essentially that the person have attended the University for at least one semester, and have contributed to the annual giving drive in the year of, or preceding his election to the Executive Committee, and finally be a person who is interested in helping out on the many activities that the Alumni Association gets involved with.

And the list of Executive Committee members is also prepared by the Nominations and Elections Committee. And the election officially occurs at the Homecoming breakfast, when the slate of one hundred-plus names is submitted to the assembled alumni at the Homecoming breakfast, who then elect them to serve (under the new by-laws) from January 1 through December 31, following their election. It is the responsibility of the Nominations and Elections Committee to see that this list of Executive Committee members is representative of the various classes of the University, as well as ages, interests, philosophies, colleges, and so forth. And based on this year's list, I think it is a very representative group of alumni of the University.

So that essentially was the first objective or accomplishment that had to be fulfilled. And since Homecoming is not until October 12, 1974 (of this year) it is too early to predict how this will come out. But I have been to one meeting of the Nominations and Elections Committee, and I'm impressed with the organization. And I know that they're going to make a very concerted effort to induce current members of the Executive Committee to run for the Administrative Board and are going to advertise in *Alumni News*, which goes out to the 12,000-plus alumni on our mailing list, to solicit the names of people who'd be interested in serving on the Executive Committee for next year. And I think from all of this, we will

maintain the momentum that I think has been building, not only this year but in the past two years, to get the alumni into a more positive role on campus and involved in some very interesting and worthwhile activities.

Now, the second project which I felt the alumni had to accomplish this year was to assist the University Centennial committee in organizing the alumni, so that they would be able to participate during the Centennial year at the University, in 1974-75, in the many events that're being planned by the Centennial committee. This resulted in my appointing a Centennial Observance Committee, which is chaired by Dave Russell who was student body president in 1967, I believe. He is a brand new member on the Executive Committee this year. And he's being assisted by Jim Hulse, who is a professor of history, as vice chairman of that committee. And I don't have all of the committee names here, but I can provide them to you, when you've typed this up. It is a rather long list and it includes people of all ages and classes at the University who have been very interested in the Centennial for the University. [See end of chapter.]

Dean Basta, who is chairman of the University Centennial committee, has written a letter which I would be happy to provide for you either for the Archives or as an addendum to this interview,* which charges Dave Russell's committee with many projects to be completed during the Centennial year. I have requested Dave, in his capacity as chairman, to carry out these projects. Examples of what is included is to help in arranging the sale of bricks from Stewart Hall. It will be torn down, I understand, during the summer of 1974. Some of the bricks are being retained by the alumni to assist in the reconstruction or restoration of Morrill Hall, and the balance that are not necessary for that project are to be auctioned off as part of the Centennial,

to raise funds for the celebration or some other worthwhile project. And I believe Dave Russell's committee will be helping on this. They are also assisting in designing and making available various memorabilia during the Centennial year to be sold to friends and alumni of the University.

It is also hoped that Dave's committee can arrange for a meeting or an event on the East Coast, probably in Washington, D. C., which would coincide with the passage of a resolution through the Federal Congress, memorializing the University of Nevada and its 100 years of history. The purpose, of course, for having this event would be to attract alumni of the University now on the East Coast, to make them aware of the Centennial, to try and involve them in alumni activities, hopefully create an East Coast chapter of the Alumni Association, to try and solicit funds for the Morrill Hall restoration drive, which I'll talk about in a few minutes, and to generally give the University of Nevada a *presence* on the East Coast, which I think any national university is entitled to.

These, as I've said, are examples. There are numerous other activities this committee is engaged in, and I will let the documents I provide for you speak to that.

The third major accomplishment, which I hoped, and I think the Executive Committee hoped to achieve this year, was to organize and implement a fund-raising drive for the restoration of Morrill Hall. This project was originally adopted as an alumni project by the alumni Executive Committee back in 1969. And at that time, and an architect by the name of Ed Parsons, who is a local architect in town, was retained by the Alumni Association to prepare preliminary drawings

*See copy in University Archives

for the restoration of Morrill Hall. I am not clear what the motivating reasons were at that time for restoring Morrill Hall. I know that it was a very important project to Jack McAuliffe, who was then the president of the Alumni Association. I know that a committee was formed to organize the restoration of Morrill Hall. And somehow, the project, after the initial plans and drawings of Ed Parsons were prepared and an artist's sketch was drawn showing what a restored Morrill Hall might look like, the project went dormant for a couple of years. And it was my feeling, as the incoming president of the Alumni Association, that if ever this project of the Alumni Association was going to be acceptable, it would have to coincide with the Centennial of the University because that was a natural time when the 100-year tradition of the University would be fresh in the minds of alumni and also in the minds of current students and faculty on campus.

The scope of the project is a rather large one. The estimates of Ed Parsons in the late 1960's for restoring the building were somewhere in the neighborhood of \$300,000, and given the inflation factor and the fact that it was not certain when this project could actually be begun, the fund-raising goal was set at \$500,000, as a realistic figure to achieve.

As first Vice President of the Alumni Association last year, I personally drafted two resolutions to get this project off the ground. The first resolution was prepared for presentation to the Board of Regents. And it was presented at their October, 1973, meeting. I would be happy to provide you with a copy of that resolution as an addendum to this. And also for the Archives if they don't have one in there.* Basically, the resolution commits the Board of Regents to endorsing the alumni fund-raising project and expressing agreement with the goal of that project,

namely the restoration of Morrill Hall and the establishment of permanent offices in a restored facility for the Alumni Association.

After the resolution was presented to the Board of Regents and received their unanimous approval, I prepared a second resolution that was presented to the Executive Committee of the Alumni Association in September of 1973—and this was also unanimously adopted—committing the Alumni Association through its Executive Committee to a year-long fund-raising drive commencing on October 27, 1973, which was Homecoming, through October of 1974. I can also provide a copy of this resolution for attachment.* This resolution of the Executive Committee authorized the hiring of a fund-raising coordinator and delegated the responsibility for screening a person to fulfill this job to the Morrill Hall Committee, which has been in existence from year to year, and which has been continued through this year. And pursuant to this resolution, the Morrill Hall Committee and the officers of the Alumni Association of last year conducted interviews of, I believe it was eight candidates, possibly more; and the final nominee of this group was Mr. Nick Lauri, who is currently a city councilman on the Reno City Council, who has had extensive background in public relations, newspaper work, and media contacts. Nick Lauri was approved as the fund-raising coordinator, commencing November 1, 1973 and ending October 31, 1974. His contract was approved at the Executive Committee meeting in November of 1973.

Basically, Mr. Lauri's job has been to present ideas for fund-raising to the Alumni Association, [and] to determine the best way

*See copy in University Archives

in which to sell Centennial medallions, which have been decided by the Alumni Association to be the primary fund-raising mechanism during this one year period. This medallion was designed by Mr. Robert Caples, who is an alumnus of the University and a well-known artist in the Reno area. His design was created, oh, sometime in the past few years; it depicts Morrill Hall on one side, and on the back side he has designed a seal which is to commemorate the 100 years of the University's existence. And I'm informed that this seal on the back side of the Centennial medallion has been officially adopted as the Centennial seal for the University of Nevada during its Centennial celebration. Dr. N. Edd Miller, prior to leaving the University, indicated that he thought it would be appropriate that this seal should become the official seal of the University of Nevada at the conclusion of the Centennial year.

These medallions are the size of a silver dollar. They are minted with silver, and the Alumni Association retained the services of the Franklin Mint to mint these medallions. The sales price of these medallions is one hundred dollars. And we have a verbal commitment from the Franklin Mint to create, or mint, 5,000 of these medallions which are then sold by the Alumni Association for one hundred dollars. And by using a little arithmetic, you can quickly determine that this would get us something in the neighborhood of \$500,000, less the costs of organizing the campaign.

During this year, since Mr. Lauri's contract has been in existence, we have sold in excess of two hundred medallions, which would bring in something in excess of \$20,000 [gross]. And in addition, we have had a number of other developments occur which I think will mean that the restoration project is going to be successful.

One of these developments was that Mr. Les Gray, who represents an estate (I believe the name is Christensen, and you can get the full name from Clela Oliver, who is the alumni secretary in Morrill Hall); he represented this estate as the attorney and executor. And this year, it came to his attention that there was \$24,000 available to be given to the University for any project deemed to be worthwhile by Mr. Gray. He came to an Executive Committee meeting in, I believe it was March, 1974, because he had heard about the concerted effort the alumni were making this year to restore Morrill Hall, and he presented us with a proposal that if the Alumni Association would amend their plans for the restoration of Morrill Hall to include a Walter Van Tilburg Clark memorial seminar room, to contain either the originals or copies of his manuscripts and working papers, which could also be used as a seminar room by students or as a research facility by the English Department, that he would like to commit the \$24,000 (or whatever the exact figure was) from this estate to the Alumni Association for its Morrill Hall restoration drive.

The Executive Committee has officially taken note of Mr. Gray's proposal. It recommended, and in fact the change in the plans will be made, that action be taken authorizing the plans to be amended so that a Walter Van Tilburg Clark memorial seminar room will be designed into a restored facility. And as the years go by, I am most hopeful that the accomplishment of this year's effort in this regard—that is the Walter Van Tilburg Clark seminar room—will be realized.

In addition, and this is material which I would like to be kept confidential until the estate mentioned below is probated and distributed, another fund-raising effort, which I have been personally involved with is going to result in a substantial sum going

for the restoration of Morrill Hall. And I'm convinced it will be the key to the completion of this project.

Because this is confidential, I will mention names but they cannot be published without my permission or the permission of the persons involved or until the estate mentioned below is probated and distributed.

In April of 1974, I was contacted by the wife of Ralph K. Wittenberg, who is an attorney in town. She indicated to me that Mr. Wittenberg was the person named as executor of the estate of Augusta Lillian Reynolds. Mrs. Reynolds had died in March 1974, and according to Mrs. Wittenberg, there were no heirs for this estate. She felt that there was a substantial sum of money involved and she had been informed that her husband, Ralph K. Wittenberg, in addition to being designated, as executor of the state, had been given complete discretion to designate a charitable organization to be the recipient of the remainder (or the total proceeds) of the estate after payment of all necessary legal fees and so forth. Now, with her permission, I went to the hospital where Mr. Wittenberg was hospitalized. (I neglected to mention that Mr. Wittenberg, himself, was in very poor health, and in fact, could pass away at any moment. And therefore, both Mr. and Mrs. Wittenberg were most anxious that he designate an organization in case something should happen, so that a worthwhile project would get the money left in this estate, rather than having it distributed to the State of Nevada for general purposes, as would otherwise happen.) I went to Mr. Wittenberg's hospital room on—it was on a Sunday in April of 1974. And I spent about an hour and a half with him. Mr. Wittenberg was fairly lucid; he had tremendous difficulty breathing, but he clearly understood what it was that I was discussing in regard to the Morrill Hall

project. I had prepared—or I gave to him a copy of the Morrill Hall brochure which the Alumni Association had prepared. I'd like to give you one to insert as an addendum to this.*

I explained to him the number of people we'd gotten involved in the Alumni Association's drive to restore Morrill Hall, including people like Dr. Fred Anderson, Senator Alan Bible, and numerous community leaders in the Reno area. And Mr. Wittenberg indicated to me that he thought this was a worthwhile project and asked me to pick up the phone and contact his attorney, Mr. Roy Torvinen, who is representing Mr. Wittenberg in the estate. And verbally, he informed Mr. Torvinen that he wished to designate the University of Nevada Alumni Association as the charitable organization to receive all proceeds of the estate of Augusta Lillian Reynolds after it's probated.

On May 8, 1974, Mr. Wittenberg was qualified as the executor of this estate. At the time of this interview, Mr. Wittenberg is in relatively good health, he has returned from the hospital, but significantly, I'm a witness to his execution of the document in which he designates the Alumni Association as the charitable legatee of the entire proceeds of this estate. And though the exact amount is not certain, the figure that Mr. Torvinen believes will be the actual amount delivered to the Alumni Association when the estate is probated (which is the reason for this confidentiality) will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$170,000. And if that money is delivered, that will give the Alumni Association, as a result of the efforts during my term this year, a total of something in

*See copy in University Archives

excess of \$200,000 toward the 500,000-dollar goal of restoring Morrill Hall.

I've also been informed (and this is through the efforts of Nick Lauri) that the National Council for the Preservation of Historic Places has placed Morrill Hall on the national register of historic places pursuant to an application of the Alumni Association, which was prepared by Mr. Lauri under the supervision and direction of the Executive Committee. The official announcement has not been made as of the time of this interview, but I have received correspondence from Senator Alan Bible which essentially confirms that this action has been taken and that an official announcement will be made very shortly.

The significance of being placed on the register of national historic places is that, as Morrill Hall is restored, the University will be entitled to a fifty percent rebate of all costs expended for the restoration of this historic site. This means as each phase is completed and the total cost is ascertained, the bill for the amount of that phase of the restoration work will be sent to the National Council, and monies have been appropriated by the Federal Congress, to reimburse the restoring agency (which I assume will be the University of Nevada) for fifty percent of the restoration costs. And this money is returned and is then available for seed money to either maintain the restored facility or to obtain additional funds to complete the next phase of restoration as that is completed.

As a result of what has occurred to date, I am confident that Morrill Hall will be restored. I think there will be some problems in determining exactly what to include, or exactly how to restore the facility, and to allocate the space in the building. My administration has not really come to grips with these problems for the simple reason

that we felt that the first priority had to be the raising of sufficient funds to make the restoration a feasibility, or at least a realistic possibility. And I'm hopeful by the end of my term in December of 1974, that the restoration of Morrill Hall will be a concrete project that will receive the endorsement of the University and the Alumni Association. And I'm even hopeful that we'll be able to get the first phase underway during the Centennial year, which will involve some testing of the current structure and where it will need some shoring up or some reconstruction in order to make it secure against earthquakes and other natural disasters, like high winds. And if we can get that under way during the Centennial year, I think that the remaining phases of construction will follow suit.*

And that basically, I think, covers what we hope to achieve. I'd like to read into the record, since I have given some thought to this, of why the Alumni Association should have chosen to make the restoration of Morrill Hall an alumni project, and why this is significant to alumni. And I think basically, there are three reasons why the alumni have chosen to undertake this project.

First, by restoring Morrill Hall the alumni will gain a functional facility on the University campus in which to establish its headquarters and to house a full-time staff dedicated to serving alumni and administering alumni programs. If Morrill Hall must be torn down, I am not aware of any plans to replace or to relocate the alumni office that currently exists in Morrill Hall. And given the pressure from the other groups and departments on campus for space, it's reasonable to assume that the alumni would have a very difficult

*See UNR Alumni News, September, 1974.

time being relocated if Morrill Hall must be destroyed. In addition, I think Morrill Hall would serve as an alumni house, or a University visitors' center, which would be very helpful in orienting persons who visit the campus, and would be of great assistance to returning alumni who may not have been back to the campus for a number of years. It would give them a place that is familiar, where they can go and look up some old friends, maybe determine if old professors are still around, and basically get an orientation on the campus in its present condition with all the new buildings, and so forth.

And we've used the theme that restoring Morrill Hall will provide a place where alumni can always "come home." Not only to alumni, but to anyone who's had any attachment to the University.

The second major reason that the alumni are attempting to restore Morrill Hall is that it will preserve the oldest building on the Reno campus and will therefore be a lasting gift, not only to the University and its fine 100-year tradition, but to the state of Nevada as a whole. Our current plans call for a museum on the third floor of a restored Morrill Hall, which would be a place to collect many antiques and cherished memories that are currently scattered about the campus, where they can be properly displayed and be easily located by people who want to come to the University and maybe see what the first 100 years of the University's existence was all about.

In addition, as I've indicated, we hope to have a Walter Van Tilburg Clark memorial seminar room, and hopefully, other seminar rooms or rooms dedicated to persons who were instrumental in developing the first 100 years at the University of Nevada. This will preserve a historic landmark, not only for the State of Nevada, but now as I indicated for

the nation as a whole, since it will officially be designated as a national historic place. And that means that not only Nevadans but all Americans, all alumni, will be proud to "come home" and see that this particular historic site was preserved through the dedication of the Alumni Association.

And thirdly, I think the reason that the alumni wished to restore Morrill Hall is that by accomplishing this project, they will be symbolically restoring the Alumni Association itself. This is going to be, if it is accomplished, the first tangible goal that is the product of the Alumni Association or of alumni working together from throughout the United States towards this one purpose. It's going to give us a direction in the future to utilize the enormous potential that the alumni at any university have, to assist the University in its effort to improve educational quality on the campus.

And this can take many forms, whether it's assisting in other fund raising projects, to endow chairs in the University, to purchase books for the library, to purchase research facilities for new colleges and departments, to provide endowment funds for scholarships, and any number of worthwhile projects which have a direct bearing on quality of education at the University campus. And any major university in the country, whether you're talking of the ivy league colleges or any other large state institution like the University of California, involve their alumni in these fund-raising efforts, whether it's direct gifts from the alumni through an annual giving drive, or in using the alumni as contacts to foundations and other large donors, to bring in the kind of money that is needed to achieve these—well, the goals of this magnitude.

And, therefore, it is my firm belief that if the Alumni Association is able to generate the kind of enthusiasm and organization to raise \$500,000, whether it be from direct gifts of

alumni or through matching funds from the federal government, through professional people getting state monies or foundation monies to be donated for this project, it's going to symbolically demonstrate what the potential of the Alumni Association really means to the University of Nevada.

And I hope that as I look back over the years, that we can see the Morrill Hall restoration project as the beginning of many significant alumni projects in which the University and alumni together begin to really improve quality of education by achieving and accomplishing some of the goals that I've previously indicated.

So that, I think, summarizes Morrill Hall. I think an interesting footnote to all of this would be that, I'm a relatively young graduate of the University; I graduated in 1964, I'm 31 years old, and not the kind of person that one would expect to be involved in pushing a Morrill Hall restoration project. It seems that this type of project is more enthusiastically supported by those who attended the University prior to 1940, when Morrill Hall was a classroom facility, a dormitory, and so forth. And to them, Morrill Hall really was the University of Nevada. For me, it is simply a vehicle to mobilize the potential of the alumni. And because it is the best organized project that we have to date, I felt that by getting young people behind the project, so that we can say that we have accomplished something tangible, that it will symbolically lead to the other things that I personally am more interested in. Such as the scholarship endowment funds, the funds for endowing chairs within departments, so we can have research professors and guest lecturers doing significant symposia for the University, doing some significant research at the University that can then be published by the University press. And therefore, I'm

sort of hoping that the Morrill Hall drive will realize my dreams for an Alumni Association somewhere in the future. And I'd thought I'd better put that footnote in, since that basically is where I'm hoping the Alumni Association will go.

The fourth major accomplishment that we tried to achieve this year, was to continue and hopefully achieve the implementation of the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations of the Alumni Association which were prepared in 1971. Basically, this Ad Hoc Committee was formulated in 1971, within the Executive Committee of the Alumni Association, to take a look at where the Alumni Association was, in terms of its relation to the campus and the various groups comprising the campus, in its relationship to the downtown community, and the groups comprising the downtown community, in its relationship to the alumni as they are spread all across the country, and in its relationship to itself. What sort of purposes did it stand for, and what sort of goals did it want to achieve?

Prior to 1971, the association had been drifting. There was dissatisfaction with what it was doing. There were lots of rumors that it was by and large a social organization, and its only purpose was to arrange a cocktail party (or parties) in connection with Homecoming, and to get a good attendance at the Homecoming football game. And because of some more serious-minded alumni becoming involved in the Alumni Association, it was the feeling that an Ad Hoc Committee was needed to define new direction, new purposes, new goals for the Alumni Association.

I was appointed chairman of that Committee, probably because I made the mistake of making the motion to have the Committee created in the first place. But

I was very lucky in having some excellent people appointed to serve with me on the Ad Hoc Committee. It included Rusty Nash, who is also a young attorney in town; Cecelia St. John; Alyce Taylor; Myneer Walker; Mrs. Newton Crumley, I believe her name is Fran Crumley; Al Pagni, who is currently the treasurer of the Alumni Association; Pat Douglass, who is married to a professor here at the University of Nevada. And if I've forgotten someone, I cannot recall at this time. I believe that includes everybody.

And this committee worked, very hard in 1971, to come up with an objective view of the Alumni association. Basically, they concluded—or this Committee concluded—that in 1971, the Alumni Association really did not have any well-defined purpose or reason for existing. It recommended that the Alumni Association develop a relationship with the following groups: One, with the University faculty, so that the alumni would understand faculty problems and provide a forum where faculty could receive support from outside the University itself. Two, to develop a relationship with students, and to become more sensitive to student needs on campus and areas where alumni could provide unique assistance to students in solving their problems, and also in developing this relationship, to induce students as they became young alumni, to support the Alumni Association in solving the needs that they as students were well aware of when they were on campus. Third, to develop a relationship with the administration of the University, to provide them with a sounding board for new ideas and new programs, problems in funding, and frankly, in obtaining individual supporters when the legislature would meet every two years, to give them voices of people out in the community who have had an attachment to the University and

who can communicate effectively with Nevada legislators as to why Nevada should continue to invest its resources in higher education. Four, to develop a relationship with the downtown community, namely with the business community, with service clubs, with professional communities, to enlist their support in developing quality programs on the University campus. In other words, to demonstrate to the downtown community that a university is an asset in any community, and that the failure to utilize this asset and the expertise that a university can bring to a community is throwing away a golden opportunity to improve the quality of life and the cultural quality of life in the community where it exists. Fifth, to develop a relationship to alumni outside the Reno-Sparks area. In 1971 we had a very poor means of communicating with alumni around the country. Our newsletter was, by and large, a gossip sheet. It contained little, if any, information about current events on campus. It did not discuss issues that that campus had become involved with, the serious issues that were confronting all universities in the country, particularly in the late 1960's, when the student protests reached their zenith. And the alumni of the University of Nevada were not being informed about what was going on, on their campus. And the scare headlines of downtown newspapers and the refusal of the alumni to get involved in any of these things, except in a negative way, such as demanding the resignation of various professors or administrators, or chastising students for having long hair, was not helping the alumni that were not in the immediate Reno-Sparks vicinity to understand what were the real issues confronting the university. And as a result, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that a more comprehensive newsletter or newspaper be submitted to the alumni,

that more mailings be achieved throughout the course of any one year, and that the Alumni Association take the responsibility to really communicate with its alumni and its membership about the significant issues and what the various sides were, and what the real needs and concerns of the University were, on a year-to-year basis. And lastly, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that, within the Association itself—that is within the Executive Committee, which is the ultimate policy making body of the Alumni Association—it was necessary that a reorganization take place. Prior to 1971, there was no committee structure. In fact, one president refused to appoint any committees because it was his opinion that as president, he was given the job of doing everything himself. And therefore, everyone else who wanted to participate would essentially show up at meetings to listen to what the president had decided and were never really asked for any input of their own, or to come up with ideas of their own, about what the alumni should be doing. So the Ad Hoc Committee suggested that there be a reorganization to define what these responsibilities and relationships within the Executive Committee should be.

Well, that was a rather substantial bill to fill. And over the past three years, some very gigantic strides have been made to carry out the recommendations of this Committee. I viewed my term, this year, as the fruition or the final accomplishment of these recommendations. And I believe that we have been successful in doing this. Attached to this interview, I have given you the organizational chart for the 1973-74 year.* [See end of chapter.] This, of course, is the attempt to organize the Executive Committee by involving as many people as possible in the affairs of the Alumni Association. We have active chapters now in Southern California

and Northern California. We are attempting to get an active chapter in Winnemucca and in Carson City. And I look forward to the day when we will have an active chapter of alumni in the Reno-Sparks area.

These chapters are set up to take alumni in their particular geographic area, get them involved in various functions, hopefully, a minimum of twice a year, if not, maybe once a year; to induce them to give more scholarship funds and other funds to the University; to assist the University in recruiting outstanding high school graduates to consider going to the University of Nevada as their undergraduate university; and to generally be a sounding board, where representatives of the University can come and Present programs, provide ideas as to what the alumni can support and get involved with in their respective chapters.

Before we get a Reno-Sparks chapter, I had attempted to appoint every person who is now on the Executive Committee and who lives in the Reno-Sparks Carson City area, to a committee within the Executive Committee. And the purpose for doing this was to generate enthusiasm this year to carry out or to implement these other recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee.

And if we want to take them in order, we can start with our efforts in establishing a relationship with the faculty. We have appointed an Alumni Faculty Relations Committee; the chairman is Hans Wolfe. (And I might suggest that we make a part of this interview the complete committee directory, which has been prepared by Clela Oliver in the alumni office.* And she can send a copy to you. It has all the names of committee chairmen and vice chairmen and members of the committees, which I think

*See copy in University Archives

would be interesting.) And Hans Wolfe has done a tremendous job in arranging a series of faculty-alumni meetings. Many of them have occurred during lunch. We've had meetings with the Dean of Arts and Science and professors in the College of Arts and Science. We've had a meeting with top administrators and professors in the College of Business Administration. We've had meetings with the representatives of the College of Agriculture. We've had meetings with the representatives of the College of Education. I anticipate we will continue these meetings through next semester. And the purpose of these meetings is to introduce faculty and administrators in each of these colleges with those persons who are now active in the Alumni Association, to develop communication, make them aware of what's going on. When I say they, make the alumni aware of what new programs and opportunities are available within each respective college and department, and to make the faculty and administrators within each college aware of the various activities the alumni are involved with and where we might be of assistance to the colleges in meeting their needs, whether it's in a fund-raising program supporting a particular aspect of the University budget that would assist their college, or simply enabling them to keep in touch with the graduates of their particular college through our Alumni Newsletter and our annual giving drive, which may give them some assistance.

I've been very amazed at the exchange of ideas that have occurred in these meetings. It seems like professors and administrators are thirsting for an audience with alumni, to bring them up to date with what's going on, to share with them their enthusiasm about the possibilities for higher education. And if ever there has been a successful program that emanated out of the recommendations

of the Ad Hoc Committee, I think this program is one. I'm happy to note that Hans was chairman under Paul Havas last year and asked to continue in this job. And he is very ecstatic about that.

In addition, we've had a tremendous success in developing a new relationship with the students on campus. This year, at my request and the request of Terry Reynolds, who was student body president, the ASUN senate, and the alumni Executive Committee met in two unprecedented meetings. These were joint meetings. The committee chairmen of the alumni and student senators had very frank and open discussions of issues and areas where students and alumni could work together.

The Alumni Association developed a new program called "Project Ask," which is a student referral service. And this is to enable students who are interested in obtaining more information about their particular job or profession to go to an alumnus or alumna out in the downtown community who is in that profession, who will sit down with the student and take some time to express what they feel is relevant in education, whether it be classes or programs, what sort of things to expect in the profession, and so forth.

The students seem to be very enthusiastic about this kind of project. And I look forward in the coming years for a closer student-alumni relationship, particularly as alumni get involved in fund raising to provide scholarship money. Hopefully, students will give the alumni the ideas for the types of scholarships that are needed to fill in, where University scholarships are unable to fill a need.

And I think that the students now feel that the alumni, as a group, are a friendly group to come [to] for advice and support on matters that alumni would understand,

having been former students at the University of Nevada. This year, they came to us regarding the issues of contracting authority by the chancellor, who wanted to take away contracting authority from the students. And the students came to the alumni and asked for our support in opposing this proposal.

Many of us that are now active in the Alumni Association have been former student body officers at the University. And Terry Reynolds's (student body president) proposal was very sympathetically received. As a result, the Alumni Association passed a resolution forwarded to the Board of Regents which in essence stated that, prior to making any decision on taking away student contracting authority that the Board of Regents should consider the history or the record of the student body here at the Reno campus, as opposed to the experience on other campuses and in other divisions of the University system, which have not had the long tradition—and unfortunately, the success—that the students have had on the Reno campus.

I do not know what effect the resolution had, but I do know that I was informed after the regents were presented with this resolution by the students, that they (the regents) deferred taking final action on the proposal of Chancellor Humphrey until they had studied it. And I was informed by the business manager for the ASUN that it had a very positive effect. And I understand that the action that actually was taken simply made the University President responsible [for student funds], but did not require that the President of the University sign all student checks that go out.

And I think that would have to be considered somewhat a victory, in view of the original proposal as it was made. And the alumni seemed to be very eager to support

this, because my impression of the discussion was that the alumni were very concerned that the student body be kept independent, and that it be given every opportunity to demonstrate its responsibility in this day and age. And we appreciated having had that responsibility as students, and feel that it's a tradition worthy of passing on to future students.

In the area of alumni-administration relations, in addition to the alumni-faculty committee progress that I told you about, this year, I have appointed a very active Legislative Study Committee. It's chaired by Tom Hall, who's a young attorney in town. And the purpose of this Committee is to obtain information from the administration of the University of Nevada concerning the legislative proposals for the University, and new policies that are being formulated within the University system. This has been a very active committee. It's actually held hearings on campus, with deans and department chairmen, and with representatives from the faculty senate, to provide information to this alumni group.

They will be making some recommendations in the fall of 1974. I assume these recommendations will be reported in our *Alumni Newsletter* and they will be sent out to various alumni, which will, hopefully, induce some individual alumni to be present at legislative hearings in Carson City, to assist the legislature in passing judgement on the various proposals of the administration for the University. I personally would hope that it would be in support of what the University is doing, but I think what is important here is that there be some involvement by the alumni, some show of interest and concern for the state University.

We have also appointed a Curriculum Committee within the Alumni Association

to work with student committees and faculty senate committees reviewing curriculum. We feel in the Alumni Association that curriculum is very important in a day and age when knowledge is growing and escalating at such a rapid pace. Many alumni who are now out in professions and in the business community, I think, are highly sensitive to educational needs as far as course content—and, well, courses themselves—that would prepare future persons going into these areas to be prepared, to assume the responsibility and to meet the tasks that have to be met. And as a result, this Curriculum Committee has been set up to provide an alumni group that can discuss potential catalog changes, or updating of courses presently offered in the catalog, to provide suggestions for new courses and types of courses, such as interdisciplinary studies and the kinds of projects around which a core of courses or laboratory situations can be designed.

The chairman of this committee was Paul Farrens, who is a graduate student here at the University. He recently had to resign, and I've appointed as his successor for the balance of this year, Mr. Mark Alden. Obviously, the Curriculum Committee will be working with the deans and administrative personnel in evaluating this area.

Tied in with this is a request by the students to involve alumni in faculty evaluation, and in the thorny problem of tenure on the University campus. The Alumni Association has not taken any stand or position on tenure or recruitment of faculty. However, the near future indicates that this may be an area where the alumni will become involved, for a variety of reasons. First, the recent graduates who get involved in the Alumni Association will be very concerned about the quality of education they received. It will have a direct bearing on the kind of training that they have

[in order] to do well in whatever profession they're concerned with.

Secondly, I think that the educational dollar is shrinking because of stabilizing enrollment. And therefore, the amount of money that is available to support education is going to be, well, will be spent sparingly. And I think the *accountability* of education will become an increasingly hot issue in the balance of this decade. With accountability obviously comes evaluation of performance and the ability of the academic institution to deliver the product that people come here for. Namely, an education.

And as I say, it's an issue that alumni have not been involved with, but it's one that I anticipate they will become increasingly involved with, particularly if a number of graduates are thinking of sending their sons and daughters to this school and they want them to receive a comparable education to any other state university in the country.

In the area of community relations, I think we're making some progress here. First of all, through the Centennial Observance Committee, we have attempted to involve groups in the downtown area in the Centennial celebration and make them aware of the existence of the University and their ability to participate in this particular function. Through the Morrill Hall restoration drive, I think we are able to involve groups in the downtown community and make them feel a part of something up here on the campus. By asking doctors and attorneys, engineers, architects, businessmen, bankers, school teachers, and numerous others to contribute to the Morrill Hall drive, whether they went to this university or not, it is giving them an opportunity to feel a part of this wonderful asset in their midst, this University. And if we can get them to give, or to participate in this particular project, I think it's reasonable to

assume that other events that are sponsored by the University, whether it's student-oriented, faculty-oriented, or community-oriented, will be better supported by people because they will have been asked to become a part of the University within their community.

Acting President Anderson had requested me to nominate some alumni representatives to serve on the Community Relations Committee of the University itself. And this I have done. The purpose of this Committee is to present a positive image to people in the downtown community, and to publicize those events which will make the people in the community feel proud to have their University here. And I think having alumni representatives on the Committee was a very wise choice by Dr. Anderson and I'm looking forward to that Committee doing some things.

The Alumni Association has also created a Speakers' Bureau, which hasn't gotten off the ground this year. And I am sorry for that. But in the future, and perhaps even during the Centennial year, there will be alumni speakers available to go out to service clubs and groups to spread the message of the 100-year tradition of the University, and to support or to drum up support of various other activities that we're involved in. And the structure is set up to do that with some follow-through.

As far as the relationship with our alumni outside the Reno-Sparks area are concerned, we've made gigantic strides in this area. We have completely reorganized the format of our *Alumni News*, which is the publication mailed out to all graduates of the University. In the past two years—or I think it's three years now—we have selected a student editor to put together the *Alumni News*. We have paid this student editor with monies that come into the annual giving drive of the Alumni Association. He's on a salary. He is expected

to put out *Alumni News* of a traditional nature, such as the names of "lost alumni," announcement of Homecoming events and other alumni events, and also to include stories that relate to the campus, and the issues confronting the campus.

And we have an Alumni Publications Committee, which is chaired by Charles Murphy, Esq. And he deserves a great deal of credit in getting this Committee off the ground. In fact, it was his wish that he be given the job for about two years (and I think he's been chairman for that period of time). And the format of the *Alumni News*, I think, has been significantly improved during this time.

At the end of my term in November of 1974, we will realize the ultimate, I think, that we could hope for in this area by publishing a Joint publication of the *Alumni News* and the *University Times*. The *University Times* is a laboratory newspaper that is put out by the Journalism Department. Its effort is to present the stories of significant interest on the University campus, the major educational issues confronting the campus, the major decisions that have been made in a particular semester, and the plans for a coming semester, and to include this with our alumni publication. In fact, the *University Times* will be an insert in the *Alumni News*. And we in the Alumni Association will pay for the mailing of this joint publication to all 14,000-plus alumni that we have on our mailing list. And it will be giving our alumni the most comprehensive coverage of campus news that I'm aware of in the history of the Alumni Association. The money for this is being contributed both by the Alumni Association and Acting President Anderson's office, or the University.

I hope I have covered our relationships that the Ad Hoc Committee report was involved with. We've decided to expand some of our

other activities in the Alumni Association this year, to try and offer more things that alumni can enjoy by being a participant in the Alumni Association. For instance, we have reached an agreement with Durkee Travel Bureau to provide a reduced group travel tour rate to Hawaii in December of this year, 1974. And this will give them the charter rates that many other alumni associations offer. And I'm hopeful a few years from now, that the Alumni Association could even offer group tours to Europe at the very low rates, so that alumni from all over the United States would want to be active in our Alumni Association, because of certain fringe benefits.

We have a life insurance program, where alumni get group life insurance rates by being an active member in the Association. And I'm informed that there is currently \$800,000 in life insurance issued to members of the Alumni Association that have taken advantage of this.

We have an annual alumni art exhibit, which is designed to induce alumni artists from all over the country to send their works back for a show and to receive recognition and awards for their accomplishments since they have graduated. This year, the alumni art exhibit is being headed up by Rita Marshall who graduated from the Art Department in 1973. And she is putting together a Centennial art exhibit, which will take place during the week preceding the University's convocation on October 12, 1974. And I think it should be a truly tremendous show, demonstrating the fine cultural tradition of the University and the Art Department. And it's a marvelous thing, I think, for the alumni to do in attracting more participants in our alumni activities.

Every graduation we have a "Golden Reunion" and a graduate reception. The Golden Reunion is to provide a reception

to the persons who graduated fifty years ago. And I think this is an event that many of the older alumni really look forward to, a milestone in their own lives. And I think it's a milestone in the University's life to continue having a tradition of fifty-year classes coming back for reunions, to rekindle old memories and hopefully, make some lasting tributes to the University, since many of them are getting up in years. And, of course, the graduate reception is to invite the new graduates into the ranks of the Alumni Association.

We have sponsored other activities, like during the University Jazz Festival, we pay for the trophies that are given out to the student participants. And I think this is very worthwhile. We have a Memorials Committee, which is set up to memorialize professors, alumni, benefactors of the University, who pass on and who have given of themselves or of their resources to the University. And it's a nice way to thank them for the effort that they have made.

And I think, basically, we've covered what the Alumni Association has been involved with this year, and what I've hoped that it would accomplish and what it has accomplished. I foresee the day rapidly approaching that the Alumni Association will have to have a full-time director in order to carry out all of these functions.

Ruth G. Hilts: A professional, paid director?

That is correct. A professional director. All of these activities that I've outlined for you have been handled by a staff of volunteers, volunteer officers, who are elected at Homecoming with the assistance of one paid secretary whose name is Clela Oliver, who is officially on the staff of Acting President Anderson. And there's no guarantee that we can even have a full-time secretary

beyond the tenure of any particular University president. And because of the things that we're getting involved with, I think the Alumni Association has been organized to the degree that an executive director is justified. And I think to make progress beyond this point, it's going to become an absolute necessity.

We've covered everything except I was very interested in knowing the alumni's role in the Presidential Search.

The Alumni Association has not traditionally or normally been invited to participate in the selection of the president for the Reno campus. I personally do not know the reasons why the Faculty Senate or the Board of Regents desired to have alumni participation this past year. However, I was on the Executive Committee when the request came from the Faculty Senate. And the Alumni Association was, I think, very honored to be asked to participate in this very important task.

The Faculty Senate had originally requested that names of at least two candidates be served on the Presidential Search Committee. And I think the feeling was that the Faculty Senate wanted to retain the final decision or authority as to who the alumni representative would be. It was the feeling in the Executive Committee that if the alumni were to be represented, that it would be appropriate for the Alumni Association, which is an independent, non-profit corporation, to nominate its own representative to serve on the Search Committee, representing the alumni viewpoint. This was an assumption, I believe, on the part of the alumni active on Exec Committee when this request for an alumni representative was made.

So, one representative was all that the Executive Committee submitted to

the Faculty Senate. Several persons were nominated for this position. Many declined because they felt they would not have the time to give to it. The three representatives that finally were nominated were Judy Nash, who at the time was Second Vice President of the Alumni Association; and Corky Lingenfelter, who has been a very active member in the Alumni Association, was a former state legislator, was at that time the Annual Giving Chairman for the Alumni Association, and Steve Brown, who was Co-Chairman of the Chapter Development Committee. There was a secret ballot by the Executive Committee and Judy Nash was elected as the alumni representative— or should I say the nominee of the Alumni Association— which was presented to the Faculty Senate. And the Faculty Senate then appointed Judy to the Presidential Search Committee.

Judy was an extremely hard worker for the alumni. She reported diligently to the Executive Committee on all actions that were taken. I know personally from talking with her, that she had attended every interview, personally reviewed every resume and recommendation that was sent in connection with the many applicants that were considered for the job. And I would certainly like my statement to reflect that I think Judy was a tremendous credit to the Alumni Association. And I think that she gained a respect for the alumni that may not have been there from faculty and students, in years gone by. But I think she was a very, very fine representative and a real asset to the Committee. And I would hope that her participation will merit alumni representation on future committees of this kind.

Have there been reactions of the regents' choice?

I would say that to date as of the time of this interview it's too early to report any reactions from alumni to the regents' choice. I can say we have had a meeting of the Executive Committee, which forty people attended, and everyone was curious about who the new person was, what sort of person or president he was going to be. I think too little was known at that time to really give the alumni present much indication, other than what's in his resume.

I personally have met Dr. Milam. And I'm looking forward to some innovative leadership from him. I think he is sympathetic to the alumni problems that we've been having. And I am hopeful that he will urge the University regents and the legislature to fund an alumni executive director's position in the 1975-77 biennium. I know from Dr. Milam's experience with the Rockefeller Foundation, that he is aware of the importance of grants and fund-raising efforts on behalf of the University. And I think he knows how to approach people, or to organize people to approach foundations to get the kind of substantial sums that we're going to need to achieve a lot of the worthwhile objectives that cannot be funded out of the University's legislative budget. And I think that the alumni are organized, at this time in our history, to assist him on that. And I hope he will recognize that potential and use it for all it's worth. And I've conveyed that message to him, and I think he will be interested in this after he gets on board. But right now, it's just a little bit too early to really know.

In summation, which might be rather difficult in view of all the material that precedes this, I'd like to close by, I think, explaining why I personally became involved and active in the Alumni Association. I returned to the Reno area after graduating from law school, in 1968, and had always

been fond of the University of Nevada, even though I had attended two other universities after graduating from here. I was invited to attend some alumni functions, and saw a lot of old friends that were present, and somehow got involved on the Executive Committee just at the time that the campus was undergoing extreme tension at the end of the Viet Nam protests, during the Kent State killings, and other national unrest.

And the Alumni Association at the time seemed to be extremely disorganized. And the only time that any movement seemed to occur at meetings was when people were reacting to the events that occurred on campus. And the reacting always tended to have a negative tone. And somehow by tearing things down, many of the alumni that were active in the Association at the time thought that good things would rise again, like the phoenix.

I did not feel that this was necessarily representative of the alumni viewpoint to what was happening on campus. And I realized that there was a tremendous potential here to develop goodwill, understanding, and support for the University that was just being left by the wayside. And the only thing that appeared to come out of the alumni were somewhat negative and disruptive positions on matters. Accordingly, if there was going to be any change it was going to require a new dedication, some new people who were willing to make that dedication. And this was basically the theme that I used to get a lot of new people active in the Alumni Association.

In 1973-74, I think—well, I know that a lot of new people have become involved. I think they're very positive in their attitude, I think they're very proud of the University of Nevada, and they're very, very anxious that the Centennial for the University be a success, that our 100 years of history be shown to the world, to really have amounted to something,

that we have produced some tremendous achievements and some tremendous persons on this campus, and that we have something to offer the students that will be coming here in the second 100 years.

And as a result, I think everything that I've talked about today has been looking towards that goal, that the alumni will become a positive and an active force within the University community, and will be used in partnership by the University in achieving its goals and making the necessary changes in the years to come. And that the days when the Alumni Association was essentially a social organization that organized cocktail parties is over. We go into the second 100 years with a truly professional organization, and one that deserves the support of all serious students who graduate from the University.

WELCOMING ADDRESS OF ALUMNI PRESIDENT

by Larry D. Struve

Whenever I have attended a gathering of alumni whether in Reno, Washington D. C., the Bay area, Las Vegas, Carson City, or elsewhere - I have always been impressed with the warm and enthusiastic way in which old friendships are renewed and the casual but friendly way new acquaintances are made. It almost seems as if we instinctively share a certain informality in each other's presence that is conducive to good fellowship and open discussion. It also enables us to easily identify with one another, having shared the opportunity of getting a college education in one of the most unique places in the world.

Because of this special quality of Nevada alumni to easily identify with each other and the University they have shared as students, I believe the alumni as a group represent a valuable asset to the University of Nevada System for the continued support of higher education in this State. To me, the alumni collectively represent a visible presence in the community at large that helps explain why the people of this State have given millions of dollars and countless other forms of support to the University of Nevada for almost a century. There are few, if any, professions and occupations that do not include Nevada alumni. Respected journalists, engineers, physicians, business men, judges, writers, artists, politicians, attorneys, and many others compose our ranks. Without fanfare, these people are helping to enrich, to organize, to operate, to educate, to finance, to enlighten, and to otherwise improve the society in which we live. Obviously, their accomplishments are attributable not to the University of Nevada but to their exceptional abilities and hard work. However, it is significant that the University of Nevada was there when these people needed it - whether as a place to grow up, to intellectually mature, to learn or to prepare for a profession, to think or to write, or just to have a good time before facing the challenges of the world.

For whatever reason, I believe Nevada's alumni are very proud and fond of their University; and if approached in the right way, I think many of them would gladly lend their

time, energy and money to help it grow and improve in the years ahead. To me, it is the purpose of our Alumni Association to nurture this support and to offer as many ways possible for individual alumni to contribute to their alma mater.

How can we do this? I think we can begin by looking at three areas that can be improved over the next year.

First, the Executive Committee must develop and support alumni programs and activities that are widely diversified. We should encourage more people-to-people type programs like Project Ask, which has brought alumni and businessmen in the general community into face to face meetings with college students. This next year, I hope the alumni will support me in arranging more face to face meetings among professors, alumni, students, and community leaders. From such interchanges, we can obtain ideas for new programs and for the improvement of old ones. It will also develop a feeling of trust and confidence among the varied individuals sharing a mutual concern for the University of Nevada. I also hope the alumni Executive Committee will sponsor a social event for the international students on our campus, to show them on a person to person basis the warm hospitality Nevada has always been famous for.

In addition, we should plan our other social events in a way that will attract both old and young alumni. This is especially important as we prepare to celebrate the Centennial of the University of Nevada next year. I

hope that we can attract a large turnout on October 12, 1974, not only to observe the traditional Homecoming activities but also to participate with the students, faculty and others in symposiums and other appropriate events to commemorate the growth of our University over a full century. These events will undoubtedly be concerned with questions about how well the University has served the purposes for which it was established many years ago and how it should be changing to meet the challenges of the future. I feel both young and old have been concerned with such matters, and we in the Alumni Association should encourage and participate in the planning now of such programs, so next year's Centennial Celebration will be a memorable event.

Also, I would like to encourage representatives of alumni, students, and faculty to attend each other's meetings and whenever possible to consider having these representatives serve and work on appropriate committees within their respective organizations. Not only will this improve the exchange of ideas to develop more diversified activities, but it will also increase cooperation to make all projects and programs more successful.

Secondly, we must make a serious effort this year to induce alumni outside the Reno-Sparks area to take an active part in this Alumni Association. Without them, we will never realize the true potential of this organization. I hope our Chapters Committee can form at least one or two new chapters this next year

perhaps in Southern Nevada and Eastern Nevada. But in addition, our Association should help organize a major fund raising event in every area of the country where there is any sizable concentration of alumni. Perhaps this can be done in connection with the promotion of our Morrill Hall fund raising project or in promoting the University Centennial and inviting alumni back to participate in the scheduled events. At the very least, such events would bring Nevada alumni together in these areas where they can become acquainted and decide among themselves how they would like to show their support for the University of Nevada.

Thirdly and finally, a way must be found to put our Association on a firm financial footing, so we can fund a wide range of programs and hire the kind of staff that will really make these programs work for years to come. I believe we can find a solution to this problem if we can successfully conduct one significant fund-raising campaign. Fortunately, we have an opportunity to do that this next year by raising a substantial sum for the restoration of Morrill Hall. The Alumni Executive Committee has already resolved to conduct a special fund-raising drive commencing today (October 27, 1973) to last until October 12, 1974, the day of the University's One Hundredth Birthday. Last week, the Board of Regents adopted a Resolution endorsing this drive and calling on all alumni and people connected with the University to help make

it a success. By selling Centennial Medallions and other fund-raising events, we hope to raise \$500,000.00 to complete this project. It is the most ambitious fund-raising goal to date by the Alumni Association.

I am urging all alumni to support this drive for three important reasons:

1. First, by restoring Morrill Hall, the alumni will gain a functional facility on campus in which to establish its headquarters and to house a full-time staff dedicated to serving alumni and administering alumni programs. It can also serve as an Alumni House and University Visitor's Center to help orient persons visiting the campus and to assist returning alumni to look up old friends and professors.

2. Secondly, the preservation of the oldest building on the Reno campus by the alumni will be a lasting gift not only to the University but to the State of Nevada. Tentative plans now call for a University Museum to be housed on the third floor of a restored Morrill Hall, which would preserve a record of the many traditions and accomplishments associated with the first One Hundred Years of the University's existence. Such a facility could become a cherished state historical landmark that would be appreciated by all people of the State of Nevada. In an age when it is increasingly difficult to honor the past, this project would be a nice tribute to the alumni of the University of Nevada, showing their commitment to preserve the honor and memory of their One Hundred Year Old University.

3. Thirdly, the restoration of Morrill Hall will be a symbolic restoration of the Alumni Association. It will represent the realization of a tangible goal that everyone can identify with. It will give purpose to the Association to demonstrate to the University the enormous potential of its alumni. It is the type of project that all alumni can enjoy the benefits of when completed - whether they visit the facility or not. In addition, it should give all who contribute to the project a genuine sense of accomplishment to see a cherished memory preserved before it is too late. In addition, the restoration of Morrill Hall will also be saving a symbol of the University itself, recalling the days when Morrill Hall was the University of Nevada, housing everything from classrooms and administrative offices to student dormitories.

As Paul Havas announced, a fund raising director has tentatively been selected to organize this special fund raising drive. His name is Nick Lauri, and his job will be to organize and assist us in reaching this ambitious goal. In keeping with my speech teacher's advice, I thought it would be a good ending to my formal remarks by calling on Nick to give us a few words on his plans and ideas on making this drive a success. Like everything else we hope to accomplish this next year, it can succeed only with your help. Thank you again for your confidence in me, and I look forward to working with you in making this year a successful and appropriate gateway to the Centennial.

CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE

Dave Russell, Chairman
Prof. Jim Hulse, Vice-Chairman
Frances Terras
Riley Beckett
David Salvadorini
Marlene Siddal
Gus Perkins
Phil Klink, Ex-officio member
Virginia Phillips, Ex-officio member
Jack McAuliffe, Ex-officio member
Clark Santini, Ex-officio member
Hans Wolfe, Ex-officio member
Bob Shriver
Pat Ferraro

UNR ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

1973

1974

OFFICERS-ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD

PRESIDENT:(Ex-officio, all committees) LARRY STRUVE
1st VICE PRESIDENT:(Coordinator of Alumni Programs) JUDY NASH
2nd VICE PRESIDENT:(Chairman, Annual Giving) TED LOKKE
SECRETARY:(Alumni Historian) BOB HEANEY
TREASURER:(Chairman, Finance Committee: AL PAGNI

CHR. PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Anne Marie Utter
CHR. IMPLEMENTIVE COMMITTEE: Tom Brasfield
CHR. SPEC. PROJECTS COMMITTEE: Cecelia St. John
CHR. NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE: Paul Havas

ALUMNI REPRESENTATIVES
ON UNR BOARDS & COMMITTEE

Men's Inter. Athletic
Women's Inter. Athl.

UNR Cent. Committee

UNR Cent. Awards

UNR PRES. SEARCH

ALUMNI REPRESENTATIVES ON
STUDENT & NON-ALUMNI BOAR

Student Activities
Board

Student Finance Cont
& Publications Board

PERMANENT STANDING COMMITTEES

Financial Committee	Annual Giving	Special Projects	Homecom- ing Com.	Program Committee	Nom. & Alumni Elect. Records
------------------------	------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

SPEC. COMMITTEES/PROGRAMS

Alumni-Faculty Rel.

Campus Needs

Chapter Development

Curriculum

Implementive

Legislative Study

Alumni-Student Act.

Morrill Hall Rest.

Project "Ask"

Publicity

Alumni Publications

Athletics Policy

Speaker's Bureau

Memberships & Mail.

ALUMNI CHAPTERS

INDIVIDUAL ALUMNI

CAMPUS COMMUNITY

SPECIAL ALUMNI ACTIVITIES

Alumni Art Exhibit

Golden Reunion

Graduation Reception

Jazz Festival

Memorials

RENO-L.V. Joint Cong.

Cent. Observance Com.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Insurance

Travel-Tours

By-Laws & A.A. Organ

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
PROFESSOR GERALD W. PETERSEN,
PRESIDENT

Gerald W. Petersen: This is Gerald W. Petersen, the president of the University of Nevada, Reno, chapter of the American Association of University Professors, and I'm reporting on the year 1973-74. This has been a fairly quiet year on the campus, and there haven't been many problems with student demonstrations or manifestations, or have there been very many problems with faculty. There have, however, been three cases of faculty members who have called upon the AAUP, together with the University Senate, and the National Society of Professors, to come to their aid in disputes with the administration. This has been going on during the year and the cases are not completely settled yet. But it looks favorable for several of the cases.

The employment situation nationwide has continued to tighten up, and as the job opportunities have diminished, the pressures upon administrations and upon faculties to adjust to this new situation have become stronger. In many places they're talking about quota systems for tenure. There is a growing concern that with no new professors coming

into the faculty at many universities that the professors who are there will be promoted in rank and will eventually receive tenure and perhaps some day a very large percentage, eighty-five, ninety percent, perhaps, might have tenure. And that's considered alarming by some people. The American Association of University Professors, however, believes that the traditional principles of academic freedom and tenure need to be guaranteed and maintained strong, and that you really can't have academic freedom without some kind of tenure. And it's been increasingly apparent that where there have been (at a number of universities over this past year) large scale dismissals of faculty members, in every case, there have been ideological, political, or just university politic[al] problems involved. The Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, for example, has given notice of dismissal to 104 faculty members, twenty-eight of whom were tenured, and they, at the same time, brought a suit before the local court asking the court to hold and to show that there was financial need.

The American Association of University Professors immediately joined with the local chapter and the professors involved and filed a countersuit. Several months ago the president of that university resigned, and the new president is listening to requests that the professors who had tenure be reinstated. But the matter is still at the court.

In New Jersey, a small college, Bloomfield, dismissed fifty-six faculty members, many of whom had tenure. Thirteen, I believe, had tenure. And several had been there for long periods of time, had given their whole life to the university. And it appeared that many of the dismissals were associated with positions of support or opposition to the president of the university, and had very little to do with the professional qualifications or performance of the faculty members. And the financial need was not really demonstrated there, either. And the President of Bloomfield publicly and privately and has even been on TV programs and repeatedly said that he thinks that there's a need to have some kind of new system of job guarantee. And so he wants to have a year-by-year contract, which he calls "professional growth" contracts. And people who demonstrate professional growth will be given renewal of contracts each year and those who don't, won't.

Well, his university senate voted a lack of confidence in the administration and in the president and a suit had been brought against them and they have gone in and hired new people to replace the ones who have been dismissed. And that makes the financial need argument look very weak.

And so there are a number of cases like this around the country which show that many factors have entered in the dismissal of these professors and that more often than not, financial need has not been the real factor, or has professional qualifications or professional

performance. But other factors have been important. And increasingly, the AAUP is being called upon nationwide to respond to attacks against academic freedom or tenure. And each year, more than one thousand claims are processed by the AAUP nationwide. And many of these are settled quietly behind the scenes with very little fanfare or headlines. And people, I don't think, generally are aware of these. And over the years on this campus, AAUP has been involved in it. At the Las Vegas campus, the AAUP has been involved in finding solutions for grievances of faculty members who felt that their rights and due rights and processes have not been followed in all cases. So it appears that what many people say is not true. Many people are saying now that there's no longer need for tenure, that in this enlightened day and age, people don't need to fear reprisals or fear that their ideas will be attacked if they're unpopular. But that doesn't appear to be the case. Nationwide it appears that there is just as much concern as ever for the guarantee of academic freedom, and that administrations, influential people in the community, are bringing just as much pressure as ever to bear against unpopular ideas and against unpopular professors who espouse these ideas.

Something related, I think, and also very interesting is the fact that even the very liberal people in this country are now finding themselves in an interesting situation with regard to certain ideas that they don't like to hear. And this is the ideas on the so-called racist ideas of Professor Shockley. And many institutions have denied him the opportunity to speak. And when he has been permitted to speak at other institutions, the faculty members and students have interrupted the program and have not allowed his words to be heard. And this has happened at some of the most liberal institutions in the country,

and some of these people have put forth very pious statements that such racist and derogatory statements should not be given open forum. They should not be dignified in such a way. But the AAUP has taken a position that all ideas have a right to be heard, however unpalatable they may be and however unpleasant their spokesman may be, that they still have a right to be heard. And if they're valid, they can stand and if they're invalid, they can fall. But the person has a right to speak, and no university has a right to deny a forum to a man because his ideas are unpleasant nor unpopular. So the AAUP has just issued a statement in support of academic freedom of unpopular men like Professor Shockley, who they say has a right to speak his unpopular ideas.

So you can see how both from very conservative factions and very liberal factions, there have been attacks on academic freedom, and the right to speak, and the right to publish ideas and the right to teach ideas. So I think we need to protect and guarantee these ideas and these principles that the AAUP has been the principal champion of during the years. And nearly all the organizations now make reference to the 1940 statement of academic freedom, which is really the guiding line for the profession in this country and also in other countries.

Now, one issue that is a very prominent issue in Nevada and in the nation is that of collective bargaining. Increasingly, faculties are turning to collective bargaining. The reasons for this are the pressures being brought by the administrations. As the job market has dried up and as administrations have looked for ways to limit tenure or to otherwise eliminate teaching positions, faculties have looked for ways to protect themselves and to find more security, when they feel that tenure is being threatened. That is one of the reasons.

And another is the inflationary spiral that we're in as faculty members find themselves being pressed and wanting a secure position financially. And these pressures, financial and political, have driven many faculties to look to collective bargaining as a means of giving them more strength. And I believe that the really deciding factor in pushing a faculty into collective bargaining—because I think usually they're pushed. Yes, I think most faculties go to collective bargaining reluctantly and do so only when they feel they are pushed.

And the problems, I think, are when administrations, board of regents, and so forth—when they don't give true recognition to university faculty government. And by recognition I mean paying attention to what they say, and accepting as valid some of their ideas, and allowing some of these ideas and suggestions to have an influence on decisions. I think very often faculty members feel that the faculty government is a charade, and it has very little influence. It's supposed to represent the faculty and have some influence on the policies and guidelines adopted for the government of the University and of the system. But very often the faculty members feel that this is not the case. And the University Senate, one, either is not listened to; two, if it's listened to, it's ignored; or three, if it's listened to, it is reversed. And when this happens, when it's not listened to, when it's ignored, when its opinions and findings are reversed, I think this leads to frustration and a feeling that they really aren't recognized as the university government, as the faculty government, even. And I think these are the things that drive faculty members to collective bargaining. And so around the nation in the last three or four years, there has been quite a move towards collective bargaining, and many campuses have looked to that as a solution for their problems.

And there have been different groups active on the campus to organize the faculty and to be their bargaining agent in a collective bargaining contract. Probably the three most important groups nationwide in being bargaining agents for collective bargaining have been the American Association of University Professors, which at the present time represents probably about thirty-five or thirty-six institutions as their bargaining agent; the American Federation of Teachers, which probably has a more militant stance than any of the other groups and which is closely related to labor union; and the third group would be the National Education Association which has several groups that represent it at the university level. One of these has a chapter on our campus, the National Society of Professors. Nationwide this is a rather small group. It has chapters on only five or six campuses in the nation. The National Education Association does have other small splinter groups that represent it at the university level. There's one in Hawaii, that's called the College and University Professional Association. And these have been the three main groups, the NEA, the AFT, and the AAUP. And when a campus decides to investigate collective bargaining, usually spokesmen for all three of these groups come and present arguments to the faculty why they think they would be the best bargaining agent. The faculty then votes and decides to certify one of these as a bargaining agent. And then the bargaining agent, working with faculty representatives, draws up a bargaining contract. And this is where the AAUP is very concerned.

The AAUP wants to make sure that any bargaining contract which is drawn up contains the principles that the AAUP has long fought for, the principles of academic freedom and tenure. And the AAUP feel very

strongly that any bargaining contract must contain these provisions and that without them, the Contract is not valuable and can even be harmful to the profession. On the other hand, the AAUP does feel, and has taken official position, that if the bargaining contract can enhance the traditional goals and guarantees of the association, that collective bargaining can be used as an additional way of achieving those goals, but that the contract must be drawn up very carefully so as to include those goals.

Now, the University of Hawaii has had a real tragedy this past year. They voted to enter into a collective bargaining situation and the American Federation of Teachers won the election to be the bargaining agent. The American Federation of Teachers drew up a contract which completely did away with many of the rights and guarantees that the AAUP has endorsed and supported for so long. One of these, for example, is the limited probationary period which has become almost a tradition in the profession of higher education in this country, being limited to six or seven years. Well, the contract at the University of Hawaii allowed for unlimited probationary period. The contract, the AFT contract at Hawaii, also allowed for a serious erosion of the grievance procedure. Whereas most universities have very democratic and systematic rules for appeals of a grievance, at the University of Hawaii, this was taken away from faculty committees and given to one man called a grievance officer and there was no appeal to his decision. A number of other things were entered into in this written contract and then it had the very forbidding language that, "anything not specifically spelled out in this contract" no longer existed.

So the faculty was quite upset at the University of Hawaii. They voted not to accept that contract and they circulated

decertification cards and the AFT was decertified as the bargaining agent, and here just in the last few weeks, a compromise has been reached in which the AAUP, together with one of the splinter organizations of the NEA (the National Education Association), formed an alliance and have been certified as the bargaining agent. And they have yet to come up with a new contract.

But that's how things have gone at the University of Hawaii this past year. And this was all brought about because the administration, over a year ago, had one of these large-scale dismissals. They announced that everybody without tenure was being dismissed, it was going to affect a large number of people, and right away they wanted to unionize, of course, when faced with a threat like that.

In thirty-six universities [AAUP] is acting as a bargaining agent. Now, a bargaining agent could be the faculty senate, but that hasn't happened in very many cases. There're only a few campuses in this country where the faculty senate has been aggressive enough and active enough to be certified as the bargaining agent. But there are a few of those cases. Most places it's one of the three groups that I have mentioned, the NEA, the AAUP, or the AFT. And they then act as the bargaining agent. So that is the position of the AAUP, then. If collective bargaining can be a tool to achieve and to protect the traditional rights and guarantees, then it should be taken. But the AAUP will agree to come onto a campus to organize for collective bargaining only if one, the faculty desire collective bargaining, and two, if there's a chance of success, if it looks likely that there will be a movement towards collective bargaining and that the AAUP has a chance of being certified. And otherwise they're not going to dissipate their time and resources into hopeless battles. And as a result

they have been quite selective. The AAUP was rather late to enter into the field of collective bargaining, entering several years after the AFT and the NEA, but has made great strides in the last two to three years.

It appears that the next session of the legislature's going to be faced once again with some enabling legislation for collective bargaining. And the faculty members here are concerned that if they do not take some steps to initiate some legislation or at least to influence that, that it's going to be introduced anyway by other people.

There are very few public employees groups now in Nevada that are not represented under collective bargaining. And the University system is one of the large groups that is not represented. Firemen, policemen, public school teachers, are all authorized to bargain collectively with binding arbitration, but university professors are not. And the junior college faculty are quite strong about wanting collective bargaining. And it's fairly certain that they're going to move for legislation. Their faculty is Quite strong in favor of some kind of collective bargaining enabling legislation.

And it's fairly certain that the regents and the chancellor will have some kind of a bill prepared, as they did the last time the legislature met, in anticipation. And so the faculty at the university feel that it's only wise for them to be working on some kind of enabling legislation which they can support, and perhaps have sponsored at the legislature.

And so the AAUP and the National Society of Professors and the Faculty Senate have joined together in just the past two weeks and have formed an ad hoc committee and are circulating a survey, a poll to sample the feelings of the faculty regarding collective bargaining. Now, this is an area in which most faculty members are quite ignorant and

which most of them are disdainful of. But I think they don't realize the situation. They don't realize that probably legislation is going to be introduced whether we want it or not. And if that's the fact, then we probably ought to try and influence it, and to have it be as favorable as possible. And that's the attitude we're taking, and we hope that this survey will show that to people and then get their feelings on some of the things that they think are important.

Some of the issues on collective bargaining, some of the details that are under discussion are, one, should department chairmen be considered part of the administration or part of the faculty? That's been quite a dispute nationwide. And it has gone both ways in different contracts. And we would have to decide that. That last bill, the chancellor wanted them counted as administration. But the faculty have always felt that they should be part of the faculty. So that's a point. Another point is, should the classified personnel be included into the same contract as academic personnel? This is a sticky point for the AAUP, because the AAUP accepts as members only academic personnel. Clerks and so on aren't eligible for membership in AAUP, and yet, they can make up to one-third of the employees of the university.

Library people are another questionable area, library staff. Library staff, nonacademic staff are all questions in contracts. It looks also like the professional employees association is going to push some kind of legislation, and we can end up—if the faculty members don't—with the nonacademic staff being represented in some kind of bill and the academic staff not being represented. And so there are lots of possibilities on that, and I'm sure this next year is going to be a very interesting year with regard to collective bargaining.

Ruth G. Hilts: Do you intend to visit the legislature?

Oh, I'm sure that when it meets that we will be active. First, we want to have some positions already taken. We want to know what the feeling of the faculty is and of our constituency in these various organizations and we want it early so that we can interview prospective candidates regarding their feelings for collective bargaining. And we want to know that before the elections, so that we know whom to vote for, and so on. And then we also want to have some idea of the kind of bill we would like to see drawn up long before the legislature meets. So already now the committees are starting to work on that. And we hope that by the time the legislature meets that the faculty will have pretty firm positions on collective bargaining and on the kind of contracts they'd like to see and the kind of representation they'd like to have as a bargaining agent, and so on. And then I think there will be a lot of faculty input at the legislature this next time around. I think that was quite a surprise for the administration the last time the legislature met, when they saw how much consideration was given to faculty members who did go and testify. And I think the administration was surprised at the attention that was paid to the faculty member representatives. And I don't think they had anticipated that. I believe the administration felt that perhaps more attention would be paid to the administration's point of view. But it appeared that the legislature was quite fair and willing to listen to almost anybody that would come, and pay attention to them. And so I think the administration learned at that point that they're going to have to work more with us and try. If we could arrive at agreement and understanding with the administration, with the regents, and the chancellor, and we could

present a unified position at the legislature, I think we'd be in a very strong position then to get the kind of legislation that we want. But if we're at odds with each other, then it's sometimes unpredictable what will emerge; you're not sure what's going to happen.

Well, we've already talked a little bit about tenure. The official position of the AAUP is that there should not be any quota, or system to limit the number of people who can obtain tenure at a university. It is felt that this would be detrimental to the profession, it would lead to a class of itinerant scholars who would never gain permanent status at any university, and would have to come and teach for a probationary period and then be dismissed for no reason other than lack of opening for tenure, and have to go somewhere else. The AAUP feels that that is not a way of strengthening the profession but rather is a way of weakening the profession. We would be strongly against any kind of quota or limit for tenure.

Other countries have had problems like this in the past and have not limited tenure and have had good results. At English universities, for example, which are some of the most distinguished universities in the world, they have never had any limit on tenure. And they have a very high percentage of their faculty which has tenure, and it has not caused them to be over burdened with "dead wood" and unproductive faculty members. I think generally there's quite a misunderstanding about tenure, what it really is. And I think among students and even some faculty members, but especially among students and townspeople, community people, I don't think they really understand what tenure is. Tenure is really the most elementary type of job security and protection. I don't think that it is any more efficient or strong or secure than the type of protection that

the civil servants have in the United States government or that the civil servants have in the state of Nevada government. I think they have laws and codes which give them every bit as much job protection, perhaps more, than tenure gives professors. And it's just as easy to fire a university professor as it is a civil servant in the state of Nevada or in the United States government. I don't think any of these, the civil service at the state level or at the national level, have such a rigorous selection process as the tenure process is at the university level. I can't think of any of these where they have a probationary period that is that long and is that rigorous. And I don't see how you can say that anybody who has gone through that selection process is going to end up being dead wood, after he has had to demonstrate for six or seven years a high level of competence and of professional performance, both in the classroom and in professional activities outside the classroom. He has had to meet a very high level of performance during all of those years, and measure up in every way before he's given tenure.

Seven years on this campus?

That's the maximum. Yeah, the maximum is seven. He has to be given tenure. That's one of the AAUP guarantees, that the probationary period can't exceed seven years. At that time, he has to either be dismissed or given tenure. But he can't be kept on indefinitely on probation; they have to make some kind of decision about the person. Practically nobody is ever nominated for tenure before three or four years. And most people don't get it before four or five years. I would say the average for tenure is probably about five years. And some people don't get it until the very end. And it's very seldom for people to get it as early as three years;

that would be highly unusual for anybody to get tenure as early as three years. At some universities it's not so unusual, but here it's quite unusual for a person to get tenure as early as three years. So five years, I would say, is average. And anybody who can go for five years and measure up and perform at a high level and have good teaching evaluations, it's hard for me to understand how anybody can say that that is going to lead to dead wood. It seems to me that just the opposite is true, that that is the system designed to retain the best performing, the most industrious, the most scholarly of the professors, and the best teachers.

Evaluation is an important thing. And steps are being taken, action is being taken among the departments and among some colleges, to make more systematic and more fair and more comprehensive evaluations. It just so happens that the department to which I belong—the department of Foreign Languages and Literature has been probably the leader on this whole campus in providing a systematic and comprehensive means of evaluating faculty members. And other departments are beginning to copy our methods and the college has taken interest in what we are doing and the president of the University has taken interest in what we are doing. But basically, what we have done is to form a committee in the department, an evaluation committee, and this committee has representatives from every rank in the department, from lecturer to full professor. They all have representation on that committee.

A file is maintained for each faculty member, an evaluation file. Now, this is separate from the confidential personnel file which is available only to the departmental chairman. But this evaluation file is kept, and in it are put teaching evaluation records, which according to the by-laws and policies

passed by our department, are required every year by all faculty members. We have our own departmental teaching evaluation forms. And these are required to be filled out by every class taught by every professor each year. And these then become part of that record in the evaluation file. Then each professor is encouraged to put all of the items that he thinks are important and that show evidence of his performance over the year, such as papers that he has had published, he's encouraged to put a copy of them in there; talks that he has read, he's encouraged to put a copy of them in there; conferences he's attended, he should have a record of that in the file; programs he's instituted, courses that he has redesigned. All of these things he should put in there. If he has redesigned a course, he's encouraged to put the syllabus in so that it can be seen. And all of this then becomes a record upon which he is evaluated.

So the committee meets once each year and evaluates all of the faculty members in three general areas, the first of which is teaching. The most important piece of evidence for teaching is the teaching evaluation form that all students have filled out. And we're trying to get away from hallway gossip, and secondhand comments. The department chairman refuses to accept or receive any secondhand gossip or hallway comments. He will receive only official comments that are made to him, and he puts them down with the date and the circumstances. Did the student just fail a test, so on. And the circumstances are put down and then that is entered into this file. Comments either pro or con regarding the teaching performance or any other performance of the faculty member. So he's rated then on his teaching performance and the major piece of evidence is the teacher evaluation form. For probationary faculty—probationary faculty are required to be visited

by committee members each year of their probationary period. And that also becomes a part of the teaching record.

And the next area in which faculty members are evaluated is professional growth and development. And this includes such things as research and publications, but it also includes such things as attending professional meetings, participating in professional affairs; any type of scholarly activity like that is considered professional growth and development. And he's gone through and given an evaluation there. And then the last area is one we call "corollary." This would be service to the department on departmental committees, service to the college on college committees, and service to the University, service to the community. And he's given an evaluation there. And each faculty member is actually given a numerical score in each of these areas, from oh, something like one to six, six being "superior," and then "clearly above average," "average," "below average," "clearly below average," and so on.

And then we have weighted factors. And we multiply these by weighted factors. We believe teaching is more important, we give that a weighted factor of ten, and the others we give weighted factors, I believe (not having the form in front of me right now), I think the one is—professional growth and development, I believe, is eight, and the other one is six. And then we multiply these by the score that they got and we actually come out with a numerical score then. And it's surprising how the faculty is distributed, and we have concrete evidence. So when the college asks us to recommend people for merit raises, we can say these people came up clearly ahead of the rest of the faculty on the basis of these pieces of evidence. And we were quite concerned that apparently, this doesn't go on in all departments, and that merit raises apparently are Quite arbitrary and

capricious. And so we're putting a big push on in our department to get other departments to have Concrete measuring devices and so that we can say, "Here's our record, where's your record for your people that are going to get merit raises?"

Have you made that one of your programs in the AAUP chapter here, to encourage the other colleges and departments?

Yes, yes, the AAUP does support this, because I think it strengthens the profession. And we have received support from the college and from the University president, too. He's been interested in what we're doing, and even the chancellor has seen the things that we're doing.

And so we're working very hard to get acceptance for this system. And we have also come up with the completely new system of evaluation of faculty departmental chairmen, which in the past have not been very systematic. And forms used by our department have now been distributed throughout the whole College of Arts and Sciences. And most of the departments are now using those forms for evaluation of departmental chairmen. And so I think departments around the University are taking steps to use more fair, more comprehensive, and better evaluation devices and forms and procedures. And I think that's all to the good, and I think that's part of this "accountability." And when we go before the regents or legislature, I think that we need to have hard evidence and show, this is the productivity of our faculty, this is the evidence upon which we're basing it. And we can pull out these folders, these files that we have got.

So we have been working on those things. I think that will really help because this problem of productivity really is hard to

measure, and we're not making nuts and bolts, or boxes that can be counted or weighed or measured. But we're trying to find ways, more concrete ways of measuring the productivity of faculty members. And I think there are concrete things that can be mentioned, like those I've just enumerated.

Instead of *productivity*, because that's such a misleading term, probably *contribution*, or some such thing should be used because I think it's fairly clear to most people that there is quite a bit of difference between faculty members. Some are much more busily engaged than others, and some spend quite a bit more time than others doing professional things. And yet it's very disheartening when merit raises go out arbitrarily. And one man can be consistently putting in sixty-five or seventy hours a week and another man forty-five, and yet they both get the same step raise. And that's very discouraging. It's hard to keep a man motivated to perform at high levels if he sees that he get no real reward. He has to have his own internal motivation there, he doesn't have any external motivation if everybody's on a lock step salary. What we're hoping to see happen is that the merit raises would be given out, not on a percentage basis, but according to the real merit, and that it would be based on concrete evidence.

That didn't happen this year. It hasn't happened in the past.

There was some merit raise this—very few, but there was some, but it was distributed quite arbitrarily. I only know about the College of Arts and Sciences. But in the College of Arts and Sciences there were a few merits raises. I think three people got a full step, and I think there were something like forty-one altogether that got some kind of a merit increase. We were Quite disappointed in the distribution of it. We felt that it was quite arbitrary. And we feel that it needs to

be regularized and go through some kind of systematic procedure to be more fair and equitable, so that merit goes where merit is due. And it probably should go through college personnel committee and they would have some kind of system set up for it.

It's hard to know how the enrollment's going to go at the University. The state of Nevada, our state population has grown so rapidly that I think that has saved us from some of the disastrous drops that other universities have experienced. And I think that we're going to hold steady. I don't think we're going to experience very much growth, but I don't think we're going to drop very much, either. I think that we're going to hold steady. And even a steady enrollment is a real problem with the financing of the University. When financing is based on a per capita thing, the financing makes it very difficult to keep up your present levels with inflationary prices. And I think that that's one of the real concerns of faculty members, is how to maintain excellence in teaching and in research when the enrollment is holding steady, and the budget is based on enrollment. Its s especially severe for the sciences where they need equipment, and in some of the departments and some of the colleges, they have been holding back now three, four, and five years in the purchase and maintenance of equipment. And they're getting to the point now where they're in very bad shape. And they are really hurting. All of the departments are hurting but some have problems that are particularly acute.

I don't know what the real answer is. I think that one of the problems in the state of Nevada is that there is no agency which is charged with planning the overall plans for higher education in the state. I think that there needs to be some kind of body or agency which plans all higher education in this state.

It seems to me that oftentimes, we've run at cross purposes; that the junior college system, the community college system oftentimes runs at cross purposes with the University and vice versa, and the DRI. And I think there needs to be an overall planning agency which would correlate and plan the roles of each one of these organizations, because I think each one has an important function to play. But I think there's a real lack of comprehensive planning and that often we get caught up in fads and we put a lot of money into one thing because it's popular, or has received a lot of attention.

I think we have gone that direction the last three or four years with the community college. It's become a kind of fad and there's been a lot of publicity against the University. Even on TV and radio, their ads, "You don't need to go to college. It's not necessary for everybody to go to college." And I think probably that's true, but we're getting a lot of negative publicity. And the community college is being portrayed as the answer to all of these problems. And I don't know if that's really true, if it is or not. And I'm not sure if anybody has really studied what the role of the community college should be.

And I think there are some very ironic situations. At the one hand, the universities have a fairly large amount of available classroom space, and yet on the other hand, they're appropriating money to build new campuses for the community college. Now, that seems to me like a very wasteful duplication of facilities. I can't understand why the community college can't be housed in the same buildings as the university and use the same facilities. I don't know why there hasn't been any agency studying that or planning that. And there's quite a lot of duplication of courses. They're offering many of the same courses that we are offering. In

many cases, we're concerned about that, about the quality of the courses and the qualifications of the instructors; we have no control over that. And yet we're required by state law to accept those students as equivalent to our own when in fact, many times they're not. And the flunk-out rate is quite high. As community college transfer students, they simply haven't received, in many cases, comparable training. And so there's need for more correlation and articulation between the community college and the University for planning, for budgets, and facilities, for courses, and all of these things. And a lot of questions need to be asked that just aren't being asked.

I don't think the traditional approach of the AAUP is being undermined. I think that it strengthens the AAUP to have a variety of professional groups being represented on campus. And I think it provides new perspectives, and provides perhaps interest to people who may not be interested in AAUP for one reason or another. If they can become interested in some other group, I think that's good to have more faculty members involved in some kind of professional group. And the AAUP has been in general agreement with the National Society of Professors about the need to be more active, about the need to study, and perhaps promote legislation for collective bargaining. And we have been in rather close agreement with the National Society of Professors. I don't think there's any chance of a merger nationally of the AAUP and NSP, and none at all of the AFT. We have had conferences where we've met together with these three groups, and we have a lot more in common with the NSP than we do with AFT. AFT are really very union oriented. We complement the National Society of Professors and of course, the AFT has not been a factor on this campus.

There was a seminar on collective bargaining on November 28, which was sponsored by the department of political science. They had a grant to study certain issues of interest to the state of Nevada, and one of these was collective bargaining. And on November 28, there was a seminar held and a representative from the American Federation of Teachers was there, and then the National Society of Professors and the AAUP. And I think it was quite apparent to everybody there, the vast difference between the AFT and either of the other two organizations. The AFT is quite a bit more militant and labor oriented, and not as professional as the other two groups. I think the National Society of Professors, particularly here on our campus, is a high quality professional organization. The AAUP has always been the conscience of the profession, and has always stood for the highest goals and principles of the profession. Many of the people are members of both organizations [AAUP and NSP]. There's quite a high level of duplication of membership.

The AAUP, as such, has not made any plans and has not been invited to make any about the Centennial of the University. I don't know how long the AAUP has been on campus; it's been quite a few years. And it has had periods of inactivity and then periods of vigorous activity. And the last four or five years, I think, has been fairly active.

I would like to see more of our faculty members join a professional organization. The AAUP is the most widely represented professional organization in the country. It has chapters on half of all the campuses in the United States. Has more than 1,200 chapters, more than 1,200 chapters across the country. And this gives it a national consensus that many of these other organizations don't have, and a national membership. But at the same time, it makes it slow and ponderous. And

oftentimes there's frustration in waiting for the AAUP to act, when things have to go through channels and it takes a long time.

With one case on this campus that occurred a few years ago, the local chapter stepped in and acted, and the national association was still sending Out a questionnaire to the faculty member asking for more details in the case when it was already solved. So it does take a long time for it to act, but when it does bring its weight to bear it's a considerable amount of weight. And it's hard to ignore it. And so it is effective when it does move, but it takes a lot to get all of that weight into motion and movement.

So there have been some frustrations with the national association. And I think that really led to the rise of the National Society of Professors, was the frustration that some felt with the slow action of the AAUP and also the opportunity, they felt, was very great for close relationship with the NEA in the state of Nevada, which is a very strong organization and has a powerful political lobby. I think anybody who's looked closely at the legislature will see that the public school teachers come out every year with very favorable legislation, and have strong support from the legislature. And the University has a spotty record and sometimes it comes out very well and sometimes it comes out very poorly. And so I think the feeling is that if we had some kind of close alliance with the NEA, we might be able to enjoy some of their political clout, and maybe come out a little better at the legislature. The danger, I think, is that our goals and purposes are not always in agreement with those of the public school teachers, and that sometimes we're necessarily going to be in conflict with them, and that's when the real crunch will come, I think. When we can't be in complete agreement with them on an issue, then I don't know what

would happen if we were closely tied to them. We might be at their mercy. So I think that's one of the real dangers with the NSP.

You spoke earlier of the three specific cases that you had undertaken this year. They're personnel matters, not to be spoken of?

Yes, I wouldn't want to put that in the record.

Just simply that you are working on them.

Yes, there are three faculty members who were given dismissal notices and in all three cases they felt that it was unfair, and that there had been violations of procedures and codes. An ad hoc committee was formed and the Faculty Senate, the NSP, and the AAUP agreed to work jointly in those cases.

There really has been a high level of cooperation, I think, this year between the Faculty Senate and these other faculty groups. Now, the chancellor and regents are reluctant to recognize any faculty group except the Faculty Senate. I've heard the chancellor several times say that he feels the Faculty Senate is the representative of the faculty. And so I think it helps when the Faculty Senate reaches out to these groups and works jointly with them.

We have a membership of about ninety members, and that's not too bad out of a population of faculty of around 600, although it's fairly low when compared to national figures. That would be like one out of six, whereas nationwide it's about twenty-five percent and many campuses have fifty percent.

Our faculty roster is loaded because of the new medical school. There are so many community doctors who are listed. They teach one course

or two, and they don't feel quite so much a part of the campus.

No, and even the full time faculty over there, maybe it's because they're so new and maybe a little bit because of the resentment over funding and things which went on last year, but I feel that they haven't been too well integrated into the campus.

I was just trying to say that perhaps your percentage is higher than it appears, numerically.

Yeah, but it wouldn't be significantly higher. We wouldn't reach twenty-five percent no matter how many votes we discounted. And we couldn't come anywhere near the fifty percent that many campuses have, and some are up seventy-five, eighty percent. I thought we were doing pretty good with our ninety members until I was talking to the western representative in San Francisco and he started telling me about all of these percentages that they have at other universities. So we do need to work, to have recruitment, to get more members involved, and to have more activity from them when they are involved. And students can be members as student members, and they probably should be. I think they do need to be teaching students. I can't remember now, we've got ten or twelve of those on this campus.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA *TERRY REYNOLDS, PRESIDENT*

Terry Reynolds: I'm Terry Reynolds. I was the ASUN President from April 1973 through 1974. When I took office, we had just passed a new constitution for the Associated Students and it was quite a revolutionary constitution, because it finally got the size of the senate down to twenty members from thirty-five. And it reorganized all of our boards, every senator sitting on a board, which—we have three boards now, activities board, finance control board, publications board—so each student was actually involved in the decision-making process of the ASUN government.

When I came in, I thought it was quite a challenge, because seventeen senators had resigned the year before and we were kind of hesitant to step into this. We were hoping that the senators wouldn't resign into the new year, wouldn't get discouraged right away. So we tried new things to keep them going. A lot of things were done. The whole senate statutes were changed. We went from alternate meeting sequence, which meant that we met Wednesday for full business and then the next Wednesday, we met just on a few items and

then the next Wednesday after that was a full item agenda again, after that. Which helps a lot of people because it wasn't so tenuous. We'd have one long meeting and then one short meeting. So people weren't spending that much time.

We had an unfortunate circumstance which was really beyond my control when I came in. Our business manager resigned over some salary problems and personality problems with some of the past officers and we unable to—I was unable to get him to stay. So in June, after he left, we started our search for a new business manager. And after we received about a hundred and forty-some applications, we decided that we weren't getting the kind of people that we wanted to get. So we met—the executive officers and one of our advisors, Pete Perriera, and our bookstore manager, Chris Cufflin, met together. And we decided that we would incorporate the bookstore manager position with our ASUN business manager position, which is one single business manager. Well, consequently, during the year this has worked very well. He's paid an additional

salary, but we saved in the neighborhood of something like \$13,000 not incorporating that position again.

Another run-off of that was the fact we got a public relations person, which was one of my goals. We have a grad student in public relations right now. She gets paid a stipend for the year. And that has worked very well in publicizing ASUN events, ASUN operations, and just getting out different things about what we do. That's been very successful.

You have to remember this is all in about the first three months of my office. The *Sagebrush* office was condemned and we had to find a new office for that. Well, back in Rick Elmore's term, after the black students had—when he took office, the black students had taken over ASUN offices. Before that, *Sagebrush* had [been] promised additional office space, and they had worked on the bottom of Morrill Hall to provide that office space. And Rick hadn't got the project going, 'cause there was really no pressure on, because the *Sagebrush* office was still fine where it was. But as the year progressed and I came into office, the office down there was condemned because it was a fire hazard.

And so we got busy with buildings and grounds and built a new *Sagebrush* office complex, *Artemisia* office complex in the bottom of Morrill Hall. I have to give buildings and grounds a very good hand on that because they got it finished in less than six weeks, so we could get all the material moved over into the new office.

Ruth G. Hilts: Have the black students quit asking for an office of their own?

Well, they have an office now. Down in Morrill Hall. The first side of Morrill Hall was completed about a year and a half ago—year

ago, and the second half was left unfinished and now has been finished since last summer. Summer of '73. So that was completed.

Kelsie Harder took the editorship and organized the office very well—is now keeping files on all the old *Sagebrushes*, all the materials being used, which has been done spottily, but it seems to get lost and it comes back. And so I was very pleased because it's the first time, I think almost in history, that *Artemisia* had had their own separate office. And now the *Sagebrush* has their own separate office. It's the first time we now have a comprehensive darkroom facilities for that, that the *Artemisia* and *Sagebrush* share. And now there's about \$10,000 worth of equipment in there.

That was another problem. All the equipment out of the darkroom had been stolen about two months before I took office so we had to replenish it. So what we did, we barred the doors and put screens on all the windows around the office and limited the keys, so we wouldn't have those problems. So far this year, we haven't had one thing stolen—not even an attempted robbery. But it's—to walk down in there, it's pretty secure.

Well, back to ASUN. With the new constitution came a reformation of our accounting procedures. Our bookkeeper, Gladys Enos, was having some problems because everything was now different, “not the way it used to be.” And we had to call in our accountants and our people that do the auditing to help us set up the books again. So we had to redo the whole accounting procedure. And as of right now, I think there are about three people that know what the accounting procedure is, and it's myself, the business manager, and Gladys Enos our ASUN bookkeeper. It's going to take the new president some time to learn that. Tom will have difficulty in finding out the workings of that but once he does, it goes rather simple.

That kind of sums up about the first few months. The summer regents meetings weren't too exciting in the first—I guess the second meeting I went to which was in June—I attended my first meeting in April and there wasn't a May meeting and then there was a June meeting of the regents. And at that time, the issue of student funds was brought up over the year. Las Vegas had just had their problems with bailing the students out with their infamous \$2500 bail bond that they put up for the CSUN students that were arrested. I had to feel some empathy for the new study body president, because his old government, the one before him, was involved into it and he stepped in with that on his shoulders, which I think had a lot to do with the problems that he had during the year.

One of the things that that first initial questioning by the regents of student funds did was to bring the student body governments of CSUN and ASUN, I think, closer than they've ever been together. We sat down during the summer. We had talks about our calendar procedures, about the banking procedures. CSUN had their money in private banks or bank accounts. We have our money controlled through the controller's office. Their money was taken out and placed within the University during the summer, placed in an agency account such as ours. And both of our governments were investigated—and I say “investigated” because I think that's what it amounted to—by the chancellor's office, through the direction of Janet McDonald. It was really a hectic time, because this was—when they started coming in—was the time when we were having our annual audit because of the change-over in our books and everything. It was quite a confusing time. Our audit usually takes about three days, and this time it took about a week and a half to get everything straightened out. And right

in the middle of that, we had the chancellor's people sitting down and going through all of our books and making sure all our procedures were going right. I spent, I think, well, came in every morning about nine o'clock and spent 'til at least five just talking with the chancellor's people, trying to explain different procedures and things to 'em.

That was a very quick orientation for me, right away, into the financial workings of ASUN. I had been involved in it before, because I'd helped write the constitution, the new one. But this was an actual, practical experience.

Well, what came out, they had a regents meeting later on, on the student fund issue, to go over what our procedures were, and the chancellor was going to make recommendations on that, it was announced. So we talked at the first meeting and we talked about going over what—well, it's hard to explain because it's sort of nebulous to anybody that really hasn't looked into it. But what we did is, we talked about how our funds are collected, how they're disbursed, what kind of money we hold for organizations, how we disburse that, how we buy things, sign contracts—every financial aspect of that, so the regents would have some kind of idea. The chancellor was beginning to look up recommendations—at that time, Janet McDonald had said that ASUN was in very good financial shape, internal controls were very good on our funds. We have good system of checks and balances to make sure that our funds wouldn't be misspent.

And Las Vegas seemed to be the one that had problems with their funds. So I helped work with Dan Wade, which was the former CSUN president, on his funds. Throughout the year, we accumulated information on both of our student governments, looked into new constitutions, and we decided that our

organization would be best if we could stay the way it is right now. So we stuck to that position.

Well, there was a November meeting where the chancellor made some recommendations toward the use of student funds, where the student funds would have to follow all the procedures that a regular department on campus would have to follow. ASUN would be no different than the Political Science Department or the Agricultural Department. We would have to submit an estimated budget to the regents. We would have to list purchases over \$8,000. Our contracts would have to be signed by the division president (which would have been James Anderson at the time), and just, you know, little procedures, little things that I'm not quite familiar with.

Well, after hashing that out in the meeting in November, we decided that that wouldn't work for each campus because we were so different and that that much work would just really burden the president. The regents shouldn't be involved in that type of thing, looking in that deeply into our operation. So we were supposed to go back and work out some procedures with our presidents. So this was over Christmas, and we had several meetings—we were supposed to report back, I think, January 4th, '74, the new year. It was a regents meeting.

The ASUN worked very diligently, I think, with the president to educate him in how our system works. I think this was one of the basic problems—nobody understood how we worked. And nobody really—well, with the constitution change, and going to one single business manager and a smaller senate, and everybody on senate being on one of the financial boards, it was kind of confusing for the new people. But I think just a lack of concern and interest was also a part of it. So we went in and we discovered that the president

really didn't know how ASUN worked. So we drew up diagrams and explained how the dollar came from the controller's office through to our office and how we purchased things and how we handled our contracts and how students were paid their salaries and—well, their scholarships, actually—and went through the whole process with him. And after we did, we convinced him that it was pretty safe, checks and balances were there; and that it was a very tight operation. And he was impressed by it. And so was the chancellor. We went and sat with him over it. And so we reported it—we just had to make a progress report at the January meeting. We made our progress report and told him we were going over it.

CSUN didn't have too much to report on, their being pretty bogged down. Their operation, I think, is— actually, it's only been, I think, for ten years they've been in the operation. Very, very skeletal operation. They were really still having problems then with— their president was having problems with his playing football and he quit. And he was having difficulty with his senate. He had to find a full-time job and he was not able to attend the senate meetings all the time. And the senate was doing things behind his back and he was trying to keep a tight rein on it. He was having a—it's a really difficult situation for him.

Anyway, to get back into our problems here—. What had happened is, we were supposed to report back sometime in March for a final dossier of what was supposed to happen. Chancellor was going to make his recommendations after conferring with the division presidents and with the student body officers. Well, I had met with him at that time about two weeks before the March meeting when I thought it was going to come up. And he had said that, to him, everything was in

order, that we wouldn't have to change our procedures at all. And then I got the agenda, the regents' agenda, about two weeks before the March meeting and looked into it, and I attended the chancellor's cabinet meeting. Well, from that meeting, things had changed drastically. They wanted to sign all our contracts at that point, and they wanted us to incorporate, as a permanent thing, a business manager into our system. Which was fine for us, but CSUN didn't have a business manager. And it was a system-wide recommendation.

Well, from that point started the fight of the control over who signs the contracts. Chancellor wanted the division president of each—well, the University and the Community College to sign contracts. And we felt that we should sign contracts, that we should be responsible, and it was taking responsibility away from us.

Well, at the March meeting, the recommendations of chancellor were just to be read over. They were not for motion, but just for discussion. And the real discussion was going to come up at the May 10th meeting, which has just ended.

Well, at the May 10th meeting, I would be out of office then, and so would the old CSUN President, Dan Wade. So we fought that because we wanted it at a time when we would be able to look into the student fund issue and we would be able to do something—still in office. And we lost on that. But from the tenor of the meeting, we felt that the regents really didn't want to give the chancellor or the division president the authority to sign contracts. When I say give the chancellor authority—the chancellor is the chief financial officer of the system and he has actually the financial authority. And what he did was delegate it to the division presidents. So he could not do that if he wished. And he could be the one that signed all contracts, because

he does do that for the divisions; he signs their contracts, unless they're under a certain amount. Let's say, if Dr. Baepler from UNLV has a contract for a computer terminal or something like that, that's worth some ten, twelve thousand, well, he has to take it up to Reno to have it signed by the chancellor. He signs over 300some contracts a year. But we didn't want to add to his burden or the division president's burdens. Personally, I thought that they should have better things to do.

In between this time, we were interviewing—I was on the Presidential Selection Committee, and we were interviewing candidates for the presidential selection. One of the chief things was on control of student funds, naturally, because it was on our minds. And we had questioned all of the nine candidates that had come in very rigorously on this issue. The two students, Don Cecich and I, had gone into that with each candidate, and we were happy to find out that of all the nine candidates, not one candidate wanted to have anything to do with having to sign student contracts, especially in his first year. That was also, I think, a positive factor for the regents meeting.

We also have got alumni support. I went to the alumni meeting. The alumni executive committee wrote a letter to regents saying that they wished they'd continue looking at the two campuses as separate entities, the two student governments, and not to put them under one system control; also, that our campus and student government has been around for almost ninety years, and CSUN only ten, and take that into consideration. I think that had a great deal to do, effect on the regents from this area. I really do. They seemed to become more interested in the problem after that letter came about, after that meeting.

So that brings us up to the May 10th meeting, which has just passed. We worked

on a compromise with Bill Morris. I talked to him about this back at the March meeting, and he said that he was going to try to come up with something. But he didn't introduce it until late in the meeting, so I got a little worried during the meeting if he was really going to introduce that or not. But at the May 10th meeting, we discussed actually the responsibility factors and the factor that the chancellor does not legally have to let the division president or he sign the contract. So that helped us out. Procter Hug assured them that this was only a policy matter, that the chancellor wanted the contracts to be signed by the division president. Well, once we got him to say that it was only a policy, not legally set, we were fine. But the matter still lies that for anything ASUN does, because ASUN is not a legal entity, it's kind of a cloud of smoke allowed to exist at the University, it's not able to sue or be sued, any suit coming into the ASUN goes directly to the whole University, into the system. So in that sense, we had to show some kind of legal responsibility. I had asked several months before of the chancellor that, if he wished, that our contracts would pass across the president's desk.

Well, the compromise that was worked out was that each contract that we do sign would pass across the president's desk, and he would have the power to stop it if he felt that it was an illegal contract. We'd all always assumed that the president could do that anyway. They've got our funds in control and they don't have to issue payment. If they wish, they can stop payment on it. But I think it's a very reasonable thing because we don't get involved in censorship over student functions, but just on the legality. I think the University had a right to protect itself in that effect.

For example, we put on The Grateful Dead concert, and if somebody would have sued the University, it was ASUN who had entered

into contract with The Grateful Dead. But the suit would have been on the University. But we did carry extra insurance on it, totaling about three million dollars, just for that one event.

That's how the student fund issue came about. It was very trying. I think we spent a lot more time than we should on it. But I think it's something that was resolved. I think it's something that had to come up. Lots of other schools faced it and they now have what's known as Title V which tells that the students can only spend so much money for certain activities. They can't pull money out of certain areas like drama, athletics, other programs, art, programs like that they have. Their money is pretty well locked in once they pay their student fees. And the regents in California have the right to control the student funds, to tell 'em that they can't have this speaker, they can't have that speaker, they can't do this or that. Actual censorship. In Berkeley, they closed down the paper because the paper, the student newspaper, was criticizing the present administration and the regents, and they closed that down. This is something we've been worried about. And I think it's water under the bridge now; I think we're pretty safe. Our paper's been responsible. The way our operation sets, I don't think this would happen. But it's always, you know, possible. But I think we've survived without having more or less a Title V type of action put on the student governments in the state.

Well, that was one on the first big issues. I [spoke] about the presidential selection committee. And that started—I think it started in the end of September or October—we started in full swing. We had some preliminary meetings, picking a chairman and trying to get the organization set up, how we were going to run the meetings. This is one of

the things I think that—took a lot more time than I thought it would, and it was very, very hectic.

Okay, as I stated before, the selection committee got started. And it was a rough start. I was kind of worried about how the other members of the committee would take what I had said about the picking of the actual members of the committee. To elaborate on that, the committee was first set up by the Faculty Senate. They were empowered to pick the size of the committee and the breakdown of the individuals on the committee. Well, the breakdown, I think, had six faculty, an alumni person, and a classified, and a student on it—just one student. Then I thought one student wasn't adequate; there should be more students on it. But I was hoping that we wouldn't have something where they added two more students and then added, on top of that, two more faculty, or three more faculty, or some other groups. I was a little hesitant about that, because I've seen that done before on other committees.

I met with the chancellor on it to talk about it after I had put out an article about the—it was in the paper about what I thought was token representation to have just one student. And I think it *was* just token representation for one student. The one student was on there in the first place because in the code, the student body president was automatically on the presidential selection committee. But with the new code, it didn't specify whether it was to be the student body president or anybody. Which was just—the procedure was approved by the regents in the September meeting. So I had asked for three students, initially, and brought that to the faculty senate, trying to pick students that were—one that was outside of student government that represented maybe the dorm students that live on campus, there being a lot of problems with

the dorms and the food and everything else. I thought they should be represented, because of a sizable monetary as well as personal concern of the students that were living on campus. And then another person that was very interested in the academic background of the University, that was a good student that had a broad background, that would look into a more academic view of a president than student or just the basic problems of housing, and the food and the dining commons. And so I brought that to the faculty senate and talked to the chancellor about it. And the chancellor recommended a new makeup to the faculty senate. And the faculty senate, JoDeen Flack, [chairperson], more or less endorsed that setup.

There was eleven people on the committee, six faculty—one classified, one alumni, one administrative person (which would be a dean), and two students. I think that's eleven people. So I went along with that because the battle, I think, had been won, that people now knew that the students weren't really going to sit back about that. And they were going to ask for representation. And I thought it was time just to get on to the business of trying to find a new president. And any subsequent turmoil over it, I think, would have really hurt the committee. So I decided that that would provide our needs, the fact that two students was a relatively good number, after considering classified only had one and the alumni had one. Even the administrative section only had one person, one dean.

So we started and sat on the committee that was approved by the faculty senate. Before I get started onto the committee work, the selection of the other student, Don Cecich—I can't forget him. I had gone for about two weeks looking for a good student that had the time to do it. And it was somebody that I had been associated with, knew [was] somebody I

could present to the senate, for confirmation to our student senate, that would want to be on it and work very hard at it. And I had actually, only one person was interested, and that was Don Cecich. I had gone, asked him about it; he had been very willing to do it. And I felt Don represented a sizable number of students on campus, because he ran against me as student body president and I'd only won by fifty votes. So I decided that Don was going to be a good choice because he was a voice of the students. And he represented at the time—he was resident-director of Lincoln Hall at the time, and past president of Nye Hall. And he knew student problems and he knew the housing problem, and the on-campus people's problems very well. So our senate approved Don Cecich, and he was the other student on the committee. It was kind of interesting because Don and I through the campaign always got along very well and we've always gotten along since then, worked very well together, and I've been very happy about that. Our relationship was—you know, has stayed very good as friends. And that made working on the committee a lot better. Because we got together and went over the student problems and student issues and compared our notes on each candidate.

Well, we started of f on the committee. And we started off about three hours a week and progressed until after around December when things started getting the short end, a little rough, I think. And we started getting oh, six hours a week and even longer in some instances. And then we started having candidates come in. come in.

One of things that was very difficult during the year that I have to mention, is, Dr. Anderson had stated before (and this is through a third party so I'm not sure of the verification of it, but I think it's true) that he was picked as acting president because he was

not going to seek the position as president. And there was a lot of other people, I felt, on campus that, if he was going to run for president, he should have not sought the presidency later on. For example, Dean O'Brien would have probably or Dean Gorrell, or somebody like that—just a thought—just someone to run the office.

It was hard when I saw the candidates coming in the lists and Dr. Anderson put his name in; he was running for president. And I always got the feeling in some way that he might have been patronizing the students a bit—patronizing me because he was trying to politic for the presidency. And I think that was really—got hard, [was a] hard thing to deal with in my term of office. I was always kind of worried about whether he was trying to make things look good, or what. In a way it was very nice, because, you know, you always got treated [laughs] well, and respect. And I always wondered if I would have gotten that before. I think I would have, I think very highly of the person. But you always have those kind of doubts in your mind. Things got rather tough over the student fund issue and a few other issues on campus. It got difficult, so you always think about these things. And then there was a lot of really kind of indirect pressure from people trying to get him in.

There was another candidate, too, inside candidate, which is Dean Bohmont. And I saw Dean Bohmont quite a lot at regents' meetings and things, and he was always very friendly.

And again, I thought, another person, you know, I had never really even talked to him before, wouldn't even know if he was patronizing me or not. Luckily, I think, I didn't have to work with him as much as I did Dr. Anderson. I think the students lost out in a lot of sense, in Dr. Anderson really playing, treading lightly in his term as acting president, not really representing the University,

because, in not trying to make enemy of the chancellor, he had to work very closely with the chancellor to get things, you know, to get things done. Things that he didn't understand, you know, that he had to do, decisions that he had to make and confer with the chancellor. I think he had to rely on him, and also running for president, it made it a very awkward, difficult situation. It was very awkward for the committee too, because I just felt that Dr. Anderson wasn't supporting, wasn't speaking up and supporting the students as much as he should have in a lot of the meetings over the student funds. And that was one of my main reasons for not supporting him when his name came up for the presidency.

He wasn't quoted in the newspapers as having said anything this year—.

That was one of the problems, and I spoke out very much. The people in the committee were kind of quiet about that. I think Dr. Driggs and I spoke out more than anybody did on that. But I was very upset about that and I think he would have had a better chance had he not gone on to be acting president—I think so.

As it progressed, we got down to a lot of our candidates. And we had the job of sending him, Dr. Anderson, a letter saying that he was not in the top running. And also Dean Bohmont and also a lot of other candidates, too. And we decided to treat it just like any other candidate, which I think was the right way to do it. And then, I always got the feeling after that, that he was a little upset about that. And later on, that proved to be true. Because he had talked to the Academic Council, the deans, to try to get us to reconsider his name again. And that we did—the committee was very stand-off on that, because they felt that it shouldn't have been reconsidered, that he

was considered, oh, over several meetings and several hours of conversation about him seeking the office, and decided that there was better, more qualified candidates. So that was very typical, I think, for a lot of the faculty and administrative people. Because working with a person day-to-day, it's rather difficult, I found it very difficult.

Well, we finally got down to—oh, we were working with, I think, sixty or seventy candidates and a new person had to come into light. And it was a person whose name was Don Gerth, from Chico, Dr. Don Gerth. And the committee wanted him to be thrown out. I thought about the name for a while: [it] sounded very familiar. So I went and talked to Pete Perriera, which is the assistant dean of students and does a lot of advising, and Pete had gone to school in Chico. And he had been very active in student government and judicial board there. What they had was Pioneer Days, like Mackay Day—about the same—so you work with the dean of students quite a bit, because it's a pretty wild time. Well, Don Gerth had been a dean of students then, when he was back there, and Pete gave me some information on Don, some things that he'd collected and over the years. And I talked to him about it. Wasn't really trying to pressure me into, you know, bringing him back in, but through my own volition I asked that Don Gerth's name be put back in the running. Well, as it turned out, Don Gerth ended up in our top three candidates and I think he would have been president, but for the fact that he dropped out, I think, about a week before and then asked that his name be put back in. I think that hurt.

Of the three candidates we finally went to the regents were Dr. Milam, Dr. Fontera and Dr. Gerth. Dr. Fontera was really an exciting man, from the Southeastern Massachusetts

University, an excellent, excellent, very exciting person. I think he would have been pretty good. In fact, the committee—and this is one thing that really disturbed me, which leads me to make some recommendations toward the selection committee—but the committee was, I think only two people (and actually one person) was only strong for Dr. Milam, and the other person kind of favored Dr. Milam but really wouldn't come out and say that. The other people were pretty solidly for Dr. Fontera, and a few of us for Dr. Gerth as a strong second choice. And there was a few people that didn't want to place emphasis on any of the three. That was a difficult situation, because after coming out of the meeting, people were really so strong for either of two candidates, and then hearing that Dr. Milam was picked was a disappointment. I think he'll do a very good job, but nonetheless, it was a disappointment. When he met with the students on campus, he was less than enthusiastic about student problems. I don't think he really knew that much about student Concerns [or] was kept up to date about that.

And students that met with him—I had every candidate that came in, I wrangled up a lot of the student leaders and got them to come into the meetings, sometimes three, sometimes four or five, six people, but always having a representative number of students in student government come and ask questions. Dr. Milam did very poorly, you know. Don was very down on Dr. Milam. And I was more favorable to him because I, you know, looked into his background. His administrative experience, I thought, was something that this campus really needed—but always worried me in the back of my mind about how he'll stand with student affairs. And it still worries me.

I think one of the things that would have helped us is to have one of the regents sitting

on the committee all the time. A lot of people think that's a revolutionary idea. And it has been tried in different areas, and some with success and some not. But I really do think that one of the regents should be one of the members of the selection committee. I think there should be less faculty. I think there should be more students, and more having all representative groups of people on campus; not just students, but classified, alumni, and things like that. The committee represents the University and the president affects everybody, from Building and Grounds all the way up to working with the regents. And I think the whole system should be included.

I also think that the chancellor should have less of a role in picking the president, in that terms.

Did he have a role at all?

Yes, he did. He had a very definite role. The chancellor saw all the candidates, all the ones that were in the top grouping, and interviewed and visited their campuses and then made a recommendation to the regents, as to the man he felt should have the job. I think the regents should—if there was a regent on there—could do away with the chancellor making a recommendation and let the committee—the committee goes and meets with the candidates, they go to his campus and things. I think they can take the chancellor out of that role, because the chancellor oftentimes picks somebody that won't challenge him, that can work with him. At times that may be good, but at times I think it doesn't add to a good academic atmosphere. Just, you know, good working relationships aren't necessarily the best for the parties in the University. So I felt very strongly with that. I'm going to make those recommendations to Dr. Driggs and it'll go to the regents. They've asked for that.

But I was disappointed that Don Gerth or Dr. Fontera didn't get selected. I thought they were two fine men. Actually, I thought all of them were fine men, and I think they'll do a good job. I just had, actually, really no doubts about all but Dr. Milam, which I had doubts about.

Is it because of his background or just simply his way of meeting people?

I think he's very quiet, very low-key approach. When he was here I thought he looked like he was in very bad health. He looked very much like he was ready to take either a long rest, or that he just wasn't feeling all that well. And so I really had doubts about that. Very low keyed, low approach. I don't know, you look at that person and you probably stereotype them as a person maybe that won't make hard decisions or that won't give, you know, what he feels out enough. I talk very low and that way sometimes, but I pick up [laughs] when I start getting excited.

I hope that'll happen. He just, you know, I was worried about his meeting with the students. He only met with us for an hour, where a lot of the other candidates met for two or three hours. I didn't really get to talk to him that much. So it was difficult.

An important point, I think, of working on a presidential selection committee was having everybody get along. And that's when I reiterated what happened when the committee was selected. I was worried about how the students would be taken in the committee. I've sat on a lot of committees on campus and have been treated very bad. Treated as a student, I mean down, down-the-ladder types. But after working with the faculty, alumni, classified people for quite some time, month after month after month, hours and hours and hours, everybody got to

know each other and thought of each other as individuals.

And I think I'd ask that as a recommendation, that one of the regents be put on the committee. And this is interesting because you might think that, okay, a regent and faculty would fight, or student and regent, or student and faculty, or student and administration. Well, we had our little problems in the committee between— oh, arguments. Dean O'Brien and I got into an argument over the foreign language [requirement] which was very educational for him and for me. I saw both sides of it and he—again, the dean saw both sides of it. I kind of say this facetiously, but he took it very grown up and I took it very grown up in the approach. But I think that's what would happen if a regent was on. He would see the tensions on the campus and the concern of the people involved. He would be educated beyond, I think, what he would ever learn by sitting on his term of regents for ten or fifteen years, in that small expanse of time.

I've been in student government for four years, and I've been on this campus now for five and a half years. I started right when I got out of high school in the summertime. And I learned more in just a few, I think seven month period, than I have learned in almost five years about this campus. I think it would be very beneficial to the regents, very beneficial.

When they sit on the opposite side, when we brought our panel to them, the chancellor recommended one [person], there was a certain amount of distrust and looking and saying, "Well, faculty wants this," or the fact that there was three political scientists presented, and Don Driggs is a political scientist and I'm a political scientist, and Mary Ellen Glass is, you know, and a few other people on the committee had kind of tie-ins in that way. And people thought, ha! You know,

they're going into that. A lot of that skepticism would have just cleared right away.

But another thing, it would take a regent that was respected by the regents, somebody who'd speak for all of the regents, and somebody that all the regents would listen to. And that's the most difficult thing in trying to get groups happy: whether you have your faculty representatives, and whether they represent everybody on the faculty; and people—can they speak for the faculty? Whether the students do, or the classified, or the alumni—that's the major problem, because otherwise with the regents picking the person, I think, you have somebody that speaks for the whole regents. And I really am gaining more insight. If they can't do that, then I think that the regents should sit in on a lot of the interviews, if they can't be with the committee throughout the whole year. At the last point, sit in on a lot of the—. But I think that the regents need to get more involved. I don't think the regents would have that much time, and are that willing to take that much time, but I think that's something they should be involved in.

I have been a critic and I probably will be, even as I continue to be an alumnus of the University, about the student's role in decision-making on campus. I can cite two examples. I'll try to limit it to those two; there were other examples. One, we started advertising—ASUN did—for people to sit on committees back in May—the first of May, even might have been the end of April—for people to sit on University-wide committees, ASUN committees, and Faculty Senate Committees, i.e. academic standards, committees like that.

Well, obviously, there's going to be a lot of committees that students are not interested in, a lot of 'em that everybody wants to be on. And that was the case. By September (which was

kind of slow; it's really hard to start advertising for committees. You start advertising at the end of the year and everybody doesn't think about it, because they're just finishing up and they don't want to be bothered. If you get too early, they lose sight of it completely by the time September rolls around), we had a lot of names for the committees. I was ready to interview those people that wanted to be on committees.

And it's a pretty hard job. I interviewed every single person that I appointed (or didn't appoint) for a committee. And there were some fifty or sixty people that I interviewed to place on selection. And that took a lot of time. But I thought it was to see if people were really concerned. The constant criticism of faculty on the faculty committees, faculty senate committees, and even University committees [is], the students don't show up for the committees, they don't become interested in the committees. So I wanted to get people that would show up, that would be interested. And I wanted to make sure that they would be on the committee, participating full-time, instead of just dropping in every month or so.

Well, the committee system on this campus, in my opinion, has fallen completely apart. And I think it's disintegrated over the last year, from a lot of people just not becoming interested, and only in certain committees, and other people just dropping off. And I think the final demise this year came from Dr. Anderson's lack of interest in keeping the committees going.

I have to submit every person's name that goes on a faculty senate committee or University-wide committee to the president. He makes the nominations. Well, the first battle was that I felt that every person that I nominated for committee should be put on. And I'm not saying that I nominated five people and there's only two positions. I didn't

feel that he should nominate, and tell me who should or who shouldn't be on. Because I was the one that interviewed 'em. He doesn't even interview or look into the students. If he did, it would be a different story, but he doesn't. And so we had our battle over that. I sent a pretty cryptic letter, telling him that I didn't think he had the right to not put anybody I had nominated on a committee. And this came over the new athletic committee that was set up. I had nominated three people for the committee and there was only three positions. And he wanted at least four names so he could pick three out of four. Well, I wanted a woman to be on the men's athletic board. I thought they should, because they pay the fee just as the male population on the campus does. So I thought they should be represented. And I was afraid if I put two men or three men and a woman (or the other way around) that they wouldn't get picked. I did this for the women's board and the men's board. They are two separate boards. Well, he sent back asking for another name and I sent a letter back saying No. And we got into the hassle about who should be nominating onto that. So I finally put on another name of another woman so, for sure, that he would have to appoint at least one woman student. And I thought the students were very good. I wasn't trying to pick somebody that was super-anti-athletics and I wasn't picking somebody that was super-pro-athletics, but somebody who would look into it.

Well, that was the first problem. Then we got to getting into the University boards and faculty senate boards. Well, he had to make the nominations. I sent the nominations in sometimes in October, and he didn't get the list out until sometime in December. A lot of the people that he had nominated weren't on the original list. For example, the Teacher Education Board, I had appointed three

students. And Dean Cain sent a letter in saying, "I would like these three students—just trying to help out." Saying, "You should appoint these three students. I've talked to them."

And I sent a letter back to Dean Cain saying, "I'm sorry. I've already appointed three students, but they're coming from the president's office."

Well, the students never got a letter, or anything. And the three students that Dean Cain had went on [the board], which was kind of bad because a lot of students came in and blamed me. And then I had to go through the whole process again and I got the brunt of it because nobody really understood the system. They came in and were interviewed by me, I told them that it had to go to the president, and he would probably have them out in a few weeks. It was more or less a token thing that he just checked them over and sent them a letter through his office saying they are on a committee. And the whole process got fouled up pretty good.

Academic Standards is a very interesting committee. I've sat on it for two years, before I became Student Body President. Well, I sat on it the year that I was running for student body president, so it would be the year, '72-73. And I sat on it with another student, Ed Klatt, which was the last year's gold medal winner. And Ed was an extremely fine student, very bright, and working very hard on the committee. And we worked on several proposals together on the committee and it was very interesting. Because [of] the faculty and deans and directors and different people on the committee—won't mention any names because there was a lot of people who just rubbed the wrong way—the committee met at a time when Ed sometimes couldn't make it, or I couldn't make it. They met at nine o'clock in the morning on Tuesdays or Thursdays.

I had a class that time, but I was missing classes to go to that committee because there was important things being discussed in the committee.

One of the things that Ed and I worked on was the withdrawal policy, and the grading policy, different things like that. Well, Academic Standards begins— and has to begin—with a lot of work to do. It begins in September; it's one of the most active committees, it meets every week or every other week. And it's pretty active.

Well, since our student senate is becoming more active, we had one of our student senators sitting on a committee just watching it, and the grad students had a person sitting on it. And I was still waiting for the nominations I had sent in the president's office so they could come—and they were waiting for them so they would have some student members.

Well, the Academic Standards Committee just incorporated the person who'd come to watch (and he only went to two meetings) and the graduate student, were going to be the student representatives, and they were going to ignore the representatives that were coming in from the president's desk. So I fought that for quite some time. And they insisted that this one person was a member and I insisted that he wasn't because I had three people waiting to get on the committee. Well, I lost the battle and I have a classic letter—I think it's over in the files—that says, that, you know, "We agree with your position, but we're not going to give in." Actually, it turned that for the whole last part of the year, there was never a student on the whole committee. And everybody was, I think, effectively denied sitting on the committee. And that sort of thing has to stop, I think, if any kind of real decision-making is going to happen on campus.

Academic Standards came up with a policy on the calendar—for the calendar year—claiming that it ought to start after Labor Day. And we have sixty-minute periods. And they said that we're cutting something like 700 students out of work—no, I think it was 1700 students out of work by having it start before Labor Day, because they have to come to school early and they can't work over Labor Day weekend. So I said, "Well, I can see right now, the only way to settle this is to have a survey of all the students, and," I said, "ASUN will conduct the survey. We will survey every student on campus at a certain time when most students are in their classes," which was between 10:00 and 12:00 on Wednesday.

Well, we surveyed something like almost 3,000 students on that. And we found that the students were three to one in favor of keeping the system we now have. And then after we presented that survey to the Academic Council, they discredited it, saying it wasn't done right and this and that, and that their intentions were still true. And what it boiled down to was just knocking three days off of the calendar for the semester; there was a hundred and seventy-eight days we used to have and now they've knocked it down to a hundred and seventy-five. But getting down to knocking those three days off was really something. Because comparing UNR with a lot of campuses around the west coast, it was found that we had much—I think three or four more days than any other school did in their school year. That's why I said, "Well, what's the problem? Why can't we just knock three days off?" Which would still put us a couple days higher than most campuses around the west coast.

So, they finally agreed to do that. But the reason they—the faculty didn't want to do it—the academic deans didn't want to do it—is,

they wanted to show the legislature that they were working a few more days and getting a few more days work in for their pay and so that the legislature wouldn't—you know. They weren't thinking about what would happen to the students or anything else. They were thinking about themselves, I think, in that aspect.

Those examples have brought me to believe that [in] the decision-making process on campus, the students are left out. There's a lot of token committee work and there's a lot of committees that work really hard and have students on them that work very, very well. But overall, the committee system on campus, I think, has started to disintegrate. I think it's something the new president's going to have to work on.

Talking about committees being reorganized and looking at the different committees, there's a few committees that stand out on the University. One of those I've mentioned before is Academic Standards. [It] is the Faculty Senate committee right now, which is under the control and direction of the Faculty Senate. I think that committee should be, actually, a University-wide committee, and it should be apportioned with students, deans, and faculty. I think it's too important a role to be left just in the hands of the faculty, or the deans, or the president, or the students. It should be spread out. They're making suggestions to deal with the total campus and they're not including people that are in the total campus. ASUN, right now, has a committee on academic standards, and I think the faculty should have their own committee on academic standards. I think both of those committees should have input into it, University-wide committee on Academic Standards.

A lot of committees on campus, I think, are fanned so presidents won't make decisions

[laughs]. They can let the committees do the work on that. I think we should cut out a lot of the committees and have one person accountable for making those decisions, for having commissions on a problem.

Do these committees actually make the decisions or do they just suggest policy to the president?

They suggest policy. And a committee can go on for years and years and years, working on policy, and it gets buried under the rug and the president says, "Well, I want this to be studied," and gives it to a committee. And it's gone.

And I will talk about what has happened with one of those problems in just a moment. But I think a lot of committees should [be] commissioned for six months or a year with a select number set, certain number of faculty, students and administrators, maybe even the president sitting on it, to go over a specific problem. And at the end of that one year, they release their recommendations and that's—the committee ends its job. And then the decision should be made within a month or so after that. I think that's crucial. Too many things have been shoved under the rug and left for quite some time.

One of those things is the foreign language requirement. In the five years that I've been here now, the foreign language requirement comes up every year. There's a grand hoopla by the students about the midpoint of the year. And by the time March, April, and May rolls around, it all dies off. This year was a very interesting year. I think we caught a lot of people in their rhetoric—I mean faculty and deans and the people in the foreign language department. I think we approached this in the right direction. First, we've got 2500 signatures [of] full time students—

which is a little more than half the students on campus— signed a petition to eliminate foreign language, which I think is—for me, any time you get 2500 students to do *anything*, you should take a look at that, because it means they are interested. We don't even get that many people, even in two years of voting, let alone two weeks of signing petitions. And I think that says something.

The next thing is, there was a resolution in senate, the student senate, to look at alternatives for foreign language to suggest the possibility of changing it, just changing it in some way to make it more equitable, more fair—looking at the requirement. We then took a survey of the Arts and Science faculty, a secret ballot. And a lot of people balked on that, didn't fill out the ballot, but we got a pretty good return on it. We got almost seventy-five percent of the faculty turned in ballots on that. Surprisingly enough, the Arts and Science faculty voted in favor of eliminating the foreign language requirement through that secret ballot. But in a ballot, in a sense that it was public, at an Arts and Science curriculum meeting, they voted almost completely the other way (not to do it) just about two months before.

There's been a lot of pressure by Dean Gorrell, and a lot of faculty don't want to—have gotten a lot of trouble for saying that there shouldn't be a foreign language requirement, which is very interesting. We brought that up. I talked to Dr. Gorrell, and I sent a letter to him asking to set up a committee, and it was going to be done through the Arts and Science curriculum committee. There was going to be faculty and he was going to let me put students on it. Well, it was the old student game again, how many numbers. He said they only wanted one student on. And I said, "No, there should be at least three students on. And I'm not going to put [on] students that are

anti-foreign language." (In fact, I put some that were Quite pro.) I put three students on, and one student was an education student, and they said, "No, you can't be on it because you're not an Arts and Science student. You don't have to take the requirement." And the reason he was over

in education is because of the requirement. I got into a super-hassle on that. And they said, this one person shouldn't—couldn't—sit on the committee because they wouldn't change the time for him, which is understandable. So I had to find a couple more people.

In between then, Dr. Grotegut, chairman of the Foreign Language Department, had sent this person— had sent a person over, and I won't mention his name— to apply for the Foreign Language Committee. The person was very pro-foreign language, and he wanted to be one of the student representatives. And so I had my vice president interview him 'cause I was in Washington D.C. at the time. And she's very pro-foreign language, but she said that, no, he's just, you know, too gung-ho for that. So those type of things were happening.

Dr. Grotegut wanted to put a grad student on who was also a TA in Foreign Language, to try to lopsided the committee. Well, I had asked Dean Gorrell that the committee have something come Out at least by the end of the year. I wanted it by the end of April, but I knew that was unrealistic 'cause there was only about two months—month and a half—and the way committees work, it takes longer than that.

Well, here we are, tomorrow's the last day of class and nothing has come out of the committee all year long. They'd let it sit. They had some proposals that were to make some changes, not really drastic changes. One was to cut it down a year; it's a two-year requirement, one was to cut it down a year.

The other one was to provide alternatives to it. And a third alternative was suggested but not put in paper, was one that each department on campus would be able to say whether or not foreign language should be required and how much required for the people in their department. Which I think is a fair way and it's done on a lot of campuses that way.

Well, the interesting thing, while all this was going on, we were interviewing presidential candidates. And I got some very good, a lot of insight, a lot of things I relayed to the people who were on the committee. One thing, we didn't mention it to all of 'em, but just about everyone I mentioned it to was against having a two-year foreign language requirement. And these were some leading educators in the country. We had Dr. Clark Kerr come in and speak on the university. I asked Dr. Kerr about it and talked to his wife almost an hour about it. A very fine person. Dr. Kerr said, "Absolutely ridiculous," quote-unquote, about the foreign language requirement on this campus being two years. And I was kind of chuckling under my breath when he said that, because it was in a dinner with the chancellor and a few of the regents and some of the faculty on campus that had been active in the foreign language requirement, promoting it. And Dr. Kerr was supposed to be the foremost man working in the Carnegie Foundation on the reports.

I think this is an example of students trying to do something and being brushed aside, not even being able to make a change. I'm sure something will happen next year, because the ball's still rolling and people are still concerned, they're pretty hot. And with 2500 signatures and a vote of the Arts and Science Department eliminating it, secretly, those are things that you can't ignore. And I know my [successor] is going to keep up on that, very strongly.

I'd like to move to almost a completely non-academic area. And that is the area of athletics. It's been a very touchy subject on this campus. I think it has, oh, I think it's been a problem of every student body president. I know Frankie Sue Del Papa was involved in it, I know Dan Klaich was involved in it, and I know Rick Elmore was involved in it. And I have, I think, a better insight into most people in the athletics because I spent six years in track and got many scholarships to run in the University, which I turned down because I wanted to get more involved in academics. And athletics and academics, I don't think, always go together, contrary to what some people believe. I'm very disappointed at the way the athletic department is run at this university. I think it's geared toward two sports; it's geared toward football and basketball. And I think that has a lot to do with the athletic director. And I've had some brushes with him before.

But my first orientation was going to the first— actually it was my second, but I spent quite some time going to the Men's Athletic Board. And I sat there and they were going over some of the recommendations. Recommendations had come out by the faculty Senate [committee] on athletics and another recommendation was being drawn up by the committee, the Men's Athletic Board as it was called. The board consisted of some— well, it was twenty-four members altogether, and a lot of those people were—I think only sixteen of 'em were voting—and the rest, eight were like alumni advisors and resource people that had come in. There'd been three students appointed to that board that—that's one thing, they encourage student votes. The ratio [was] about three to one, four to one; they really couldn't do anything.

I went with one of the student members that day, because they were voting on what

they were going to, you know, put out in the recommendation. And they were doing everything from having people that weren't supposed to vote on the things (and I couldn't), and people voting by proxy. And they even questioned me being there, when I'm an ex-officio member of every committee on campus. And I was making more sense than they were: they weren't recognizing my motions. And disregard for parliamentary procedure. They're saying, "Well, I talked to so-and-so today and he would have voted for it," that way.

And that's when I finally came to the realization that *something had to be done* about the athletic board. It was just deteriorating. All the power, I thought, was going into the athletic director and he was just controlling the whole show. And the board was the puppet. Which I still think—which I'm hoping that it doesn't become that now.

Well, I had long conversations with Dr. Miller about that. And I was afraid that he wouldn't make a recommendation before he left. It was a very problematic area. Alumni were breathing down the University's throat. Mr. Trachok has legislative contacts, alumni contacts, and everything, and he was putting the pressure on not to give the proposed board administrative status where they could make decisions, only advisory status, which was only fair. I think they should have just had advisory status. But looking into it, I was afraid that Dr. Miller would not make a decision, but he finally did. And I think it was an equitable decision. He split the board up. There's more students on it, less faculty. The athletic director is not a member of the board. He reports—and this is a problem, whether he reports to the board or whether he—meaning that he has to be at the board, that he has to give information to the board, or whether he just shows up at his convenience.

This is a problem; whether or not is unclear right now. But I think the board now is trying to look into— seriously look into—how the funds are distributed.

The men's ski team had to almost beg for money to get back to the nationals in Vermont. And this year there hasn't been those kind of problems. The meet is closer, which has helped in the funding. It's almost 1500 miles closer.

But then there was the firing of the tennis coach. Well, it was the baseball coach, actually, Keith Loper, who was the baseball and tennis coach, too. And the word had come out that Mark Magney had complained about his budget, about how things were running, and been a critic, and vice versa, or the same with Mr. Loper. And people weren't getting along with Dick Trachok. And I think that they have some very valid points. All the money was being siphoned off into football. We're in a foot race right now; at least the alumni would like to see us in a foot race right now, and some other people would, too, with UNLV and their football team.

I think we've been passed, and passed beyond catching up, on the basketball scene. I see there, you know, things happening that I can't believe. And I think what's going to happen is there's going to have to be a decision made on this campus, on whether we're going to try to provide a wide variety of sports, and try to get as many people in it as we can. Or are we going to try to have a large spectator sport arena, where we try to pack in ten, fifteen thousand people for football, or the same for basketball? And, to well, effectively slide under and give minor sports status to things such as skiing, baseball, golf, tennis, and those type of sports. And I think that's what happened. And I hope the trend is reversed, and I hope this new athletic board takes the trend up and reverses it.

With this new board does the men's athletic director still report directly to the president?

He does report to the president. And this is one of the things that Dick Trachok said, "I report to the president just like any other person on campus, head of department, or anything." Which is not true. There's not that direct connection. And I think that the athletic director is given really an unfair advantage. He controls all the information, he has all the budget figures, he can give out what he wants (or not) to the committee. And so the committee really can't do that much. And once the committee has the power to demand everything to know what all the expenditures are, then they can make some definitive decisions, that otherwise they will not be able to. And that's the kind of battle that is going on now.

The committee didn't even start this year—the athletic committee didn't even start until January. And the budgets had to be in the president's office for the next biennium within almost a month. So the first thing the committee did—very green members—was to have to go over the complete athletic budget within a period of about two weeks. This type of thing is very unfair. It's impossible for 'em.

I think that my personal recommendation—and I was going to ask this publicly—I thought that Dick Trachok should resign. I don't think anything can be done progressively, any changes will be made on this campus in the field of athletics, until he is gone. And I'm afraid that that's what has to—and I'll say that publicly. Because I really do think that he should leave. He's too oriented toward two sports. And there's a camaraderie between the football coach and he, and the basketball coach and he. And with all that, they're going to control the money.

I know a lot of people, a lot of good skiers on—I've skied for fifteen years now, and have

raced also. And a lot of my friends that have been on the ski team

are dissatisfied with the quality of the program. And we used to attract good skiers here. But we don't any more and we're going to lose that unless they get a good coach. Clinton Malfalcon is a very good coach, but he's very young, and it's hard for him to coach people that basically are almost his own age. They need more of a—I don't know, in coaching you need almost a father figure type of person. And they can't—well, it's just hard to get a coach that'll come in. It's easy to get a young coach just starting out, like Clint, who wants to build up his status and go to another school or something. But you can't get an older person who has to come in and work for the budget they've got. And that's why they're going to lose good coaches, and we're not going to have a good ski team any more. We were rated—one magazine rated us third in the nation. Another one rated us seventh. But that's still an accomplishment for our ski team, I think, our collegiate ski teams.

So I was very disappointed in the first months of my office about the athletic thing. But it's something you learn to live with and there's other more important things on campus. I enjoyed being taken out to lunch by the coaches and Dick Trachok. I mean the coaches, I have to say, Jerry Scattini, Dick Trachok, and the basketball coach (Padgett), and telling me that I should keep athletics in mind for the new president—pick somebody that's, you know, directed towards athletics. I almost felt like saying, "Well, somebody that's directed towards football? or somebody that's directed towards athletics?" And it all came out obvious that they want somebody that'll support football and basketball. It was all said in an indirect way. And in private conversations, Dick Trachok has said that to me.

I had several dealings with Dick Trachok and I've gone in and talked to him even though we're at odds-ends a lot of times. I feel that it's best, even, just to go and talk to him, too. I think this is an important point how I got to at least to a friendly relationship—maybe not, almost adversary, but still friendly—with Dick Trachok.

Mel Baleson, the tennis player, him and his cousin Glenn Grisillo had come from South Africa to play tennis. And at the time they were promised some certain things that were illegal, that they couldn't be given, but once they were over here and promised. One of those things that Mel Baleson was promised was a scholarship, a waiver—out-of-state waiver. And he was willing to work in terms of this—but he was promised an out-of-state waiver, in that he would work...on campus to help pay for that. And at the start of this year, Dick Trachok said that he wouldn't even see him, that he wasn't going to give waiver to him. And it was just that; I'm not simplifying it. He just said that he will not talk to Mel any more about it. And so Mel came to me, because he was at his wits' end he didn't know what to do and he was—you know, out-of-state tuition is eight hundred and some dollars, and he was worried about, you know, not being able to finish up in school. And he was promised that 'til he finished up. And it wasn't that he was, you know, taking extra semesters to finish or anything. He was finished in the time he had allotted for this scholarship. So I went to President Miller and we had a meeting between President Miller, Trachok, and I; and Trachok ended up giving Mel the scholarship that he deserved—the waiver. And he finally got it. But it was only after some pretty hard coercion that he did get it. And I was very disappointed in that. That never made it out in the papers, or anything like that. And well, Mel and I became very

good friends after that. Dick Trachok and I got to know each other very well after that.

And so, it was one day when I was in talking to him, we were talking about seating in the Coliseum for the basketball games. There hadn't been enough student seats and he was trying to see what sections we should open up, and some comments I would have. And we began talking about women's athletics, and about Dr. Lilly and the separation, and some of the problems that Dr. Lilly had faced being in the P.E. Department under Dr. [Robert] Laughter, I think it is, who's the head of the P.E. Department. Dr. Laughter and Dr. Lilly don't get along at all. And Dick Trachok and I were talking about that. And it was best for her to be on her own now. But the feeling was, we were talking—Dick Trachok [and I] were talking about the student funds, seven-fifty allocation, the history behind that. And we were talking about women's athletics and what he thought should be done, what I thought should be done, and it came into a thing that there should be more funding from the University. And I think it was something he suggested just for me to get off his back. But that, you know, "women should get more money but don't take it away from us" type of thing.

And I said, "Well," I said, "I think there should be, you know, more equality of funding," I said, "if it happens to really to give equality in funding, not from student fee, but from the state, that it might cut away some of your funds." And we talked about some proposals. And I was asking him about the makeup of a recreation fee for students to get involved in intramurals and recreation.

So I worked on a package—and I'll go into the first part of the package now—was to give women's athletics an extra allotment. And what happened, what I suggested, was that the University administration give more money

to women's athletics through state funds and things like that, giving 'em more support that way. And in turn, students would up their fee—they now receive \$2.50; they received a dollar and a half more. This is confusing because it was all in one package.

So I made the recommendations to our student senate that certain conditions would have to be made by the University, that we wouldn't just throw them the money unless they provided money for extra coaching, because you're increasing their budget threefold when you give them a dollar fifty more (which doesn't seem like much, but to start an initial program, to get them back on their feet, I think was a good move). It was more or less—might have been—just a token effort on our part, but it showed that we were willing to help if the University stepped in it. It starts something that builds, I think, and won't digress.

So it was turned down in senate the first time it was presented. And there was a lot of hard feelings, that they had thought the funds should be split, the seven-fifty should be split down the middle. And they thought we should go with that just to let them know. And it was pretty strong towards that one. I thought that it was not a realistic position. That you could never do that, because the men's department would just not split with the money. And the students still said, "Well, yes but it should be equal."

So I wrote up a new proposal. And the new proposal included that the administration would match us in terms of not only—maybe not dollars but in terms of equipment or coaching or whatever, to help the women's program, and that as the women's program grew, there would be an equality in the funding to come within the nine dollars, if the amount was approved, not without. So you wouldn't have seven dollars for the men and

seven dollars for the women. You would have, within your nine-dollar allocation, say, five dollars for men and four dollars for women. So it would even out that way.

Well, the vote was taken and it was passed nine to eight—by one vote in the senate. And then after that, I took it to the regents and the regents then passed it. But I think it was a milestone for women's athletics. And it was something I fought personally. I didn't get any help from anybody. I stuck my neck out to do it, and I would like to take credit for it, because I'm the one that battled it. I met with the chancellor, I don't know how many hours and for different reasons, and the athletic department, Dr. Lilly, and we went over their budget and looked really deeply into the athletic department. I really feel strongly that the women *need* more money. I think for a five-year projection, the two-dollar increase we've given 'em will work out. But I think they're going to need more money. I hope to see their program grow.

I think the regents are becoming aware of that. I think there's a whole trend in the country towards increasing women's athletics. There was talk about a suit to get women's athletics going. Well, that never materialized. And I think the extra funds took a lot of thunder out of the suit. But I still can foresee the day I think a suit, maybe brought for more equality and funding. Because for a woman student to pay seven dollars and fifty cents and all they receive is fifty cents, is very inequitable. If she wants to go into sports, and if she does compete, and if she wants to travel, she should have every right to travel in the same comfort that one of the men athletes does. And they don't now. And let's hope that that will even out.

The papers were going to do a story about the men athletes, where they sleep and what they eat, and compare it with the what the

women do, and it was never brought out. But there was some contention that the men were staying in some of the finest hotels and eating some very good meals.

Why was the story never written?

Well, they could never get enough information on it. I was going to go to one of the games, one of the football games, and stay with the team and eat with 'em and just see. I didn't have a chance to get away because I was so busy in school.

But the other part of the recommendation, which I'm very excited about, was in conjunction with the new athletic complex. And this is another one of my proposals, to have an intramural recreation fee which is only a dollar, but what it will do for the student is, any student on campus will be able now to go up and rent camping equipment, athletic equipment, backpacking equipment, skis, anything like that. We're going, through the direction of Lee Newell and Dr. Laughter, they're going to institute a whole type of recreational program.

Also, part of the funds (which a dollar seems like not much, but it's about ten thousand a year) will go towards placing lifeguards for intramurals in the pools. So each pool will have a couple lifeguards for intramural water games and things. Keeping lifeguards is very expensive, and they have to be W.S.I. lifeguards. And they have to be paid state wages. You can't just get people, you know, to come in and sit. You have to have lifeguards available. So I think it's very beneficial in that aspect.

And also, for paying officials, for basketball games, baseball games, different kinds of [events] like that. You can't get volunteer officials because competition is so intense that people say the official was cheating or

something. So you have to get outside officials, and that means you have to pay them. But I think this will greatly increase the number of sports and the quality of the intramural program. It's just a start and I think they can put more money on it.

In fact, I would eventually like to see a very, very strong athletic program, a shift away from the intercollegiate athletics. My personal belief is that intercollegiate athletics has gotten to the point where it's been distorted, the students are being taken advantage of, their bodies are being used, not to the best health or advantage. You go to school to learn an education and I think you don't go to school to become a professional athlete. I think if certain schools want to do that, fine. But I think the University of Nevada should make the decision whether it's going to go into that role or not. And I would hope not. And that would mean a stronger intramural program.

One of the things that ASUN has dealt with, and I've dealt with, [and] I think this campus is going to have to deal with in the next few years, is the problem with the dorms. The dormitories are having trouble filling with students. And in terms they have to pay off their debt on their bonds they've been taking out from the government. And so the less students they have, the less money they have naturally, and so they've had to raise prices to live in the dorms to help meet some of the costs. Well, right now we have one dormitory that's completely empty, Juniper Hall. And it's not paid off and won't be paid off for quite some time. So that has a financial drain on the rest of the system.

Well, this has been an ever fighting battle trying to get the dorm fees stabilized and not have 'em keep going up and up and up. To go into this, they were raised the second meeting I went into, which was in, I think, June, and

they were raised again in September, and then they were planned to be raised again this last March. So that's three times in almost the last year, they've been raised. And the problem is—one of the problems is—they used to have, like, about eighty-three percent capacity around this time, mid-spring semester. Things pretty well stable out. This year, they have sixty-three percent in the dormitories, which has caused quite a problem financially.

Also these problems have been compounded by the fact that the dining commons—they tried to get a contract food service in last year and they went through an excellent process with the students looking into each company that they were going to use. Ed Pine sat in with the students, they discussed back and forth, the students actually picked the food service they want, and it was approved. And then there was the problem with the state employees, some of em being replaced. And the first initial ruling was that the University could not enter into a contract food service and that they must keep the state employees on.

Well, we were back to running a state operation. Now, before I should go into this, I should explain to you that all dorm operations, dining common operations, are classified "auxiliary enterprises," which means that they do not receive state funds, that they are self-supporting enterprises. And so they have to make money.

Well, the dining commons, in order to pay the high increase of wages for having state employees that've been on for ten, fifteen years—washing dishes, or cashiers, are making almost five, six dollars an hour in that field (maybe five dollars an hour, six was maybe a little high). Looking at the statistics, there was one person making close to six dollars an hour in a job that downtown wouldn't pay any more than something like

two dollars [because they've got their step increases, the state employees—I after being here ten to fifteen years. And it's hard.

And with the economic situation, the price of meat, the price of milk and vegetables, it's really hard to make an operation run itself. And students obviously—once the contract service couldn't go into effect, then they had to keep the state employee and they had to keep paying those wages. And with the rising increase in food, they had to raise the cost of what was planned to be a lowered cost in their rates.

Well, what happened during the year is, they couldn't keep a seven-day operation open, they only had a five-day operation open. With the outlawing of cooking in the dorms, that means students have to go out on the weekends to eat. There's no place for them to eat on campus. They're trying to keep the snack bar open on weekends, but that wasn't financially sound. They couldn't do that. So we're having one whole problem. Now, why these fit together with the dorm and the dining commons is, incoming freshman's required to live in the dorms, they're required to buy a meal ticket. So it comes in one complete package. And that complete cost has been going up and up and up.

Back in September, we were going over two things. One was, a lady was from Elko, a very prominent family, sons and daughters had come to the University, were now enrolled in the University, and sons and daughters that were going to be enrolling in the University. And she was worried because she wanted them to live in the dorms. But she was worried about the quality of dorms. We were also talking about cost at that time, at that meeting. And I had made the argument that the more you charge for the dorms, the less people you're going to have. Students can't afford to live in dorms like that. They can

live off campus cheaper. And once they're not required to, anything they can do to get out of being subject to living in the dorms, they will just leave the dorms. They will go and find somewhere else. And they will live with a few friends off campus, and they can do it cheaper. Now, the students always can find a way to economize. And I got the argument from Mel Steninger that said, "Well, you represent your constituency; I represent the taxpayers of Nevada."

And I tried to tell him that it's a self-supporting enterprise and it's not costing the taxpayers one cent. But it's going to if they don't do something because a deficit is building up. And just to open up next year, fall of '74, they're going to have to put out \$33,000 just to open the doors. Because they've gone under that much. I think almost hundreds of thousands of dollars were lost in the dining commons during the years when Mike Lane was in it. You can remember the scandals back in the years of '69 and '70, over the quality of the food and how the operation was running.

But I worked to try to get something done with this and was involved during the summer last year, '73, and we were picking a new dean of housing. And I think it's a very important position because this person is in contact with oh, some six hundred and some students—seven hundred and some students—that are living in the dorms. And he's directly involved with the lives of quite a number of students. And it's a large operation. Well, one of the things that we're looking for is somebody that had new ideas that could work with falling off enrollments in the universities, which meant fewer people in the dorms, and had worked with large dorms. Well, we thought we found a person in Carl Keeler, the new assistant dean of students in care of housing. Carl's an excellent person, but like the last person—I just talked to him the other day—Carl's

very disappointed because they, the student services personnel, worked diligently on a problem in the dorms and he's come up with ideas and tried to make 'em work, but it takes money. And the dorms are down now; they don't have the money. It's going to take state input, and the feeling is, well, we can't give it that money 'cause it's not supposed to have money. It's supposed to be self-supporting.

Well, Carl and I've been trying to work all year toward getting money for programming. Well, programming money allows, like, speakers, movies maybe in the dorms, weekend barbecues and things like that, to make students want to live in the dorms, to give 'em an advantage, and to get money to help fix up the dorms, to improve the halls, to get new furniture, to get TVs, to institute some kind of a system where students pay like an activity fee in the dorms, to help them out. And all this is met with some kind of, well, disdain over the year. For Carl it's been rather discouraging, because here he's got all these ideas, and he just doesn't want to run the status quo all year long because it's not working. He wants to do new things and he wants to try ideas, and you can't blame him for, you know, being disappointed. He's been very disgruntled and even thinking of leaving because—.

Who said no?

We'll get into the budgeting process with that. In the March meeting, they had asked for another rise and saying that prices have gone up, which they have, understandably. But I brought up the argument, the enrollment's drawing down—they were going to raise it something like \$20 per student extra. And I worked it out mathematically, showed that by raising it \$20 per student, they were bound to lose ten or twelve students. Which would

not cover the deficit they were trying to do anyway. So it was just fruitless to try to keep on raising it. Well, the argument finally went across and they asked the student services personnel to prepare a report on the dorms.

Well, they did. It was supposed to be presented to the May 10th meeting. And the chancellor took some of the points—I don't know—but ignored a lot of the important points, I think. Money for programming, which I've been trying to get, he's ignored that. But they're still getting onto a positive—it's a complete 180-degree turn from where we were last September, in trying to make the dorms a better place to live. The philosophy is starting to sink in, and I hope that some concrete things will happen. But I think this is one of the problems, that we'll keep on losing good young people. We've lost Jack Tyler because he was disgusted (and he was a good friend of mine), last dean of housing. Because he was disgusted with the money aspect, trying to get money for programming, also having to run on tight budget.

One thing you have to understand is that Operations of the dorms is split. We have Shirley Morgan who has the financial side of it, sort of; Carl Keeler who runs the dorms, the personnel type, who actually is supposed to be the housing person; and the purse strings are with Ed Pine, vice president of business. And so it's so decentralized that no really coherent decisions can be made. It's always pocket decisions and there's quibbling between the parties and, you know—. It's not the best way to handle the operation. I think the new president will probably do something about that 'cause it's an obvious problem. I think that there needs to be control financially with one person and that person will have to decide policy, too. He has to be accountable to somebody, sure, but I think he has to have purse strings to operate. You can't separate like

that, ask a person to do things in the dorms and then have no money to do it with. And I think that the state is going to have to break tradition, and to get this auxiliary enterprise on its feet, to pump in some money on it. It won't take much, I don't think. I think you can make dorms a good place to live, advantageous, educational. And I think that in some sense, the University should be getting out of the housing business altogether in a lot of areas.

We're trying to plan a new [student] Union. And Juniper Hall is included in our union plans, into doing a union expansion. Looking to Juniper Hall as an alternative for offices, or for different types of functions, bookstore, health center, different things like that. Using them, as long as they can't fill them with students, using some alternative use. There was a 2.3 million-dollar union expansion plan which would have cost students an extra fifty dollars a year. And as soon as I came into office, I put the squash on that, because student population isn't increasing that much. We will never need that big of a union, unless we get up to 15- or 20,000 students. So we instituted in our union expansion committee a philosophy of trying to use existing facilities on campus and see what we can do with what we've already got on campus, instead of building big structures that will cost students many dollars that won't be used.

I think getting back to the problem with keeping good young people in, I think that we have to give them some kind of money to work with, look into their ideas. People on campus here are willing to work, willing to do a lot of things, but aren't accepted in their ideas. They're shoved aside a lot of times. And I think that's a problem for a lot of the—what I consider the—very bright young faculty and staff people at the University. "Very

oppressive atmosphere” is what was on the front of the *University Times* by Dr. Risser. So I think that’s an example, as of many other faculty, administrative people I’ve talked to on campus. They get very, very disgusted at times. But the good thing about it is that a lot of people are still here and still willing to work. But after a period of beating your head against the wall, you get discouraged and leave. And I think a lot of people may leave, but that’s why I’m hoping for a change in leadership, a good one.

Well, to get down to a humorous thing. I guess for some people, it wasn’t so humorous. It dealt with Delta Sigma Pi, which was a business fraternity. It’s an honorary fraternity. And it’s been exclusively for men. I did some research into it. Rick Elmore worked with it. With the Affirmative Action statement that came out, I guess it was either December of ’72 or in January of ’73 the new statement—one of the statements that’d come out. There’s since been another revision which is even stronger. But Delta Sigma Pi was told that they would have to open up their organization to women or that they would cease to be recognized by ASUN. And I have to say that ASUN has the authority to recognize or not recognize all groups, all organizations on campus that’re undergraduate student organizations.

So Delta Sigma Pi was having a national congress back east last summer, ’73, and was going to go back and present an amendment to the national charter, which is the hang-up for not letting women in, to try and get women in. Well, the amendment was defeated, and so there was no change in the charter. Every year that their congress did meet, some go over their charter and they propose new charters. Well, the charter with that amendment was defeated, and so the amendment was taken out.

Well, we looked into the matter of Delta Sigma Pi and brought it to our attorney, the

ASUN’s attorney. And we ceased to recognize them, which started the whole hassle, which at times was very funny, because some of the arguments were being made were reminiscent of those arguments being used (and I got a kick out of this) being reminiscent of some of the arguments that were used during the period when the blacks were being discriminated against, and saying, “Well, we have nothing against women we just—you know. Why can’t they start their own organization?”

And they’re saying, “Well, we can get separate organization that’s equal to yours,” and they went through all this progression of the “separate but equal,” and “well, we’ll just move off campus,” and things like that.

It was, in a way, at times, it got rather trying, but I found it kind of a light spot in my day when I got to get down to business of looking into Delta Sigma Pi. And finally, we had some great hassles. We had the battle with their attorney, finally went to judicial council, saying that we didn’t use due process in not recognizing them. And they challenged the fact that ASUN could recognize or not recognize, but they didn’t have the power to revoke. Which they said by not recognizing them, we revoked their recognition, and we didn’t have the power to do that. It’s not in our constitution.

Well, that was all straightened out. And we did do it by due process. We did have the right to recognize or not recognize or revoke; the semantical battle didn’t hold in that case. We had a hearing on this oh, sometime in February with Delta Sigma Pi’s attorney, and I represented us. Our attorney didn’t come, he was busy, and I felt I could handle the case. And it was one of the more fun things I’ve done, I think, in my college career here, was represent that case. Because it was such an obvious, blatant case of discrimination. And we did win the case. And their attorney,

I think, was hot under the collar because he's a young attorney. And he was—you know, thought that it would be very simple things. He came in with all his legal briefs and things, very confident in presenting the argument. But for somebody to come in from the outside who doesn't know anything about ASUN, and who doesn't know the operations—and I had all the cards and all the knowledge, and it was kind of fun.

But I think what turned out was fairly good. Since then—I may have to reflect on that a little bit. But Delta Sigma Pi did let in women, into the organization.

On this campus or nationwide?

Not nationwide. They're being sued on fourteen campuses by the Women's Equity Action League. And they're waiting for some ruling of HEW.

And I think the crux of the organization is that the organization, being in the organization of Delta Sigma Pi (or the business fraternity)—actually it's more an organization—gives you the right to use a special scholarship fund or to apply for special scholarship funds and I thought it was discriminating for women in business not to be able to use that fund. Also, they advertise employment in their magazine. Also, being a member of Delta Sigma Pi gives you, I think, an advantage over other students in the business field for employment. And I thought that was very discriminating to women. Well, since, its national chapter has written back and saying that they're going to revoke their recognition nationally for letting in women, but they haven't done so yet. And I think they'll wait. Because this is happening on a lot of campuses.

For example, in California, I think in the university system (not the state college system), they're banned on campus. A lot of

states they're banned from the state, because they do discriminate. So I think there'll be some loosening up of that. It's really funny, we got an article one day from the Southern Mississippi University where they were going over the same problem that we were. And I called up and talked to the editor of the paper there, talked about where they got the information, because their campus was included in the Women's Equity Action League suit. And I attended a National Student Lobby conference in Washington D.C. and I went in and talked to one of the ladies that handles these types of discrimination suits. And HEW knew she was very interested and they gave her all the information. They were about ready to drop our campus, too, into the suit before that. And they still will be interested in it, to see what happens.

But it was a landmark case, of a campus organization allowing women in, and not losing their national charter yet. So it's going to be used as an example, nationally. And I think it's kind of a fun thing. I don't think it hurt anybody. There's, I think, two women students that went in, that have been initiated in, and now full members of Delta Sigma Pi. And I thought one of the most comical things is their advisor, Dr. [Katherine] Duffy has become an honorary member of Delta Sigma Pi. And she is a woman, very prominent.

She was their advisor on campus—a woman? And yet they wouldn't allow women into their organization?

Right. And I thought that was another irony. I thought it was very funny.

I don't know, in summing up some of the things that I'd like to say—little gems of wisdom. One of the things is that being a student and being student body president is at times really difficult, very difficult. Because

you're still a student and you find yourself getting away from the regular students sometimes and finding that you're—. I've seen this happen. 'Cause I've known personally all the student body presidents since I first started here. Where you get detached from the students and you really can't see their problems or point of views as well as you'd like to. I think that's a problem of student body presidents. Plus you have to be a student; you have to go to class and you have to graduate and get some grades. And I've been fortunate, I spent a fifth year to do this. I went to school four years and completed all my undergraduate work. I finished it last December and I only had six credits to finish up. And then now, I'm just taking (or took) extra courses, which was advantageous.

I think one of the strongest recommendations—and I'm talking to the regents about this informally—is that they should allow student credit for being in student government. At least six credits. I think that'd take a lot of the load off students. They'd be able to carry a larger load and get that out of the way. But there's been a problem of who will recognize that credit, the political science department or— They turned that down. Whether it should be—I think just the mechanics is one of the things that slowed it up considerably.

And I think that students have to realize that— which is hard at time, and you have to tell yourself, and I had to tell myself, and I see the new student body president going through the same things, and I saw Rick Elmore doing it—that you're *only* student body president, that you're *only* a student, and that there's a lot of people who've been here a lot longer than you have. You have to realize that. You're working with an organization, the organization goes on and you leave. And it's very hard for a lot of students to realize, they're

here for maybe a short period of time, and a lot of faculty are here for ten or fifteen years. And they've been here and they know how to weather the changes and ride the tide, as the expression goes. And students sometimes get a little short and try to change things. But as I said in one of my articles, it's a *good* thing. And we've been going over a battle with the chairman of the Board of Regents who says that student government is not an educational experience, in that sense. And I would have to say it's *very much* an educational experience.

And one of the things I've said in one of my articles in the student paper is that the students are expected to go out of the University and to be leaders in the community. And I'd hope that they would be. And I think that it's the will of the administrators and people in education that students will go out and be leaders in the [community] after they leave the campus. They [should] be given realistic roles on campus and I think this year, as through a lot of the past years, the students haven't been given that realistic role, and that it should be—that we should be opened up more. And I think once that happens, I think we'll produce some better people in the community, people that are willing to go Out and lead.

There's a great gap between just finishing college and going out into the real world. Sometimes student life can be a fantasy life. And I think the students have to suffer some of the hard knocks—have to realize and make mistakes and right their mistakes. And this is why I think one of the most important arguments was made over student funds, letting students keep the control over student funds, to sign their own contracts, to be responsible, is because if they are responsible now, they'll know what responsibility is when they get out and start working. And they'll be able to handle it better, than having all thrust

Out on 'em when they step off the threshold and they're out in the world. I think that there's too much of a father image on some of the people. And I think Chairman Jacobsen also, I think I enjoy him because he represents a lot of those things that I don't believe in and he keeps me in check, I think. But too much of a father image and too much, you know, "We got to keep those students in line." Which in some ways was true, but students have grown up quite a bit, I think. They know the games and they know how the players play, and they're pretty mature and adult about some of the things. And I think the regents, and especially, Chairman Jacobsen should take that into heart.

Talking about the ASUN as the whole organization, I think an interesting point should be brought up. ASUN, through the chancellor's interpretation—well, let's put it Procter Hug's interpretation through the chancellor—that ASUN is an administrative arm in the University, which in some ways is good, and some ways it's bad. But I think it's an exciting process, if the philosophy behind it is followed. ASUN is left out alone; it has been for the last three years. People have left it alone; student services personnel is getting farther and farther away from it. They're doing things like—which I have no objection to—holding meetings, trying to get students interested in becoming a Greek or, you know, helping the sororities and fraternities get new members. Well, I think they should also be helping the ASUN get people into student government. And they're starting to get back into this after bitterly complaining about it.

Another thing was the Delta Sigma Pi thing. We asked for—because we were spending a considerable amount with our attorney—we asked the University attorney to step in. Well, at times when they want us to be part of the University, we're part of the

University; when they don't want us to be, we're not—we can't use their services. And I think there's been a great gap between, you know, "Okay, today you're a part of the University;" tomorrow, "You're not." You do something bad, you're not; if you do something good, you are. And with that gap comes a lack of understanding.

I've talked about this in the regents meeting, that a lot of people don't understand the function of ASUN; in fact, students don't—a lot of students don't, as well as faculty and administrators. They don't spend enough time in ASUN seeing what we do. And I think a lot of people could learn—this is what gets into educational experience, not just for students but for the whole community—to learn by seeing what we do, the things we attack in the institutions, the changes we want, what will keep things going.

I think the University life is very exciting, because it's always progressing, always changing and always reevaluating itself. I think students are an integral part in that. So that's it.

BOARD OF REGENTS

HAROLD JACOBSEN, CHAIRMAN

Harold Jacobsen: During the recent academic year, 1973-74, part of the greatest concern for the Board was to hire two new presidents. We hired a president in Las Vegas and one in Reno. For almost a year, we had two acting presidents. We had President Jim Anderson at UNR and President Donald Baepler in Las Vegas. It's worked out very well. I believe the last time that I recorded on this, Dr. Zorn was already gone, had resigned and gone back to teaching. And then Dr. Baepler was appointed for a year to be the acting president. And at the commencement in Las Vegas in May, he was sworn in as the president. So he's a regular president now. And Jim Anderson's been acting president since the resignation of Edd Miller last year, 1973.

Edd Miller left here August of 1973, to take a position as president of Maine—Portland Gorham. In other words, there's two campuses there and—well, it wasn't a step up; it was pretty much of a parallel step. And Edd felt very strongly (and most successful presidents are this way) that a university president in these times shouldn't stay on more than about eight

years or so. And so he was looking around for another place. He regretted leaving, but I'm sure that he enjoyed the challenge back there. And I'm sure that the University benefited a great deal by the years he put in. And he was probably right; it's best to move on, and let someone else come in with some new ideas.

Even during the short time that Dr. Anderson was in as acting president, he came up with some new ideas and innovations that were good for the University. Really too short a time to see how these things work out.

Speaking about UNR—well, for both universities— we made a nationwide search for a president. The search committee was appointed by the chancellor with the approval of the Board [of Regents], but the selection committee was chosen according to the Board of Regents hand-. book. So we had one in Las Vegas and one in Reno; they were independent of each other.

Ruth G. Hilts: Were both boards chosen the same way? The one in Reno was appointed by the Faculty Senate.

Yeah, they both were, with the approval of the chancellor. The Board of Regents set it up that way.

However, I don't believe that that's the best way to select a president. I think there should be more input, more control by the regents and more information to the regents as the search proceeds. Some problems came up that wouldn't have happened had a member of the board or some of the regents been involved in the committee. But that's the way our by-laws say to do it now, so we stuck with it. I don't think it's ever a good idea to change your by-laws when you're doing something. But I'm going to suggest that we take another look at the methods of hiring a president.

If I don't do anything else on this recording, I do want to point out what I think are the major problems of the University over the next decade. The first one is that we have been geared to increasing enrollments and increasing income, and then suddenly we're faced with *decreasing* enrollments and *slowly* increasing incomes not enough to keep up with fixed costs, such as salary scales. We have to take a look at how we're going to finance higher education in the years ahead.

I want to point out that I'm sure that the reason for the decreasing enrollment is not the fact that we have community colleges; it's just the *times*. It's national. The young people find that they can get out of high school and go to work for a company who will train them and pay them large salaries, and they can make more money than they can if they go to the University for four years. And the old fable that you make twice as much if you had a high school degree as if you only had the eighth grade, and then if you went on to college you made twice as much as if you just had the [high school diploma], isn't true any more. Now, that could have been true years ago and it was always told to the young people

and the students as the fact. But I'm not sure that that really always was. And I'm absolutely certain that it's not true now. Because as you know, the labor unions and so forth, they're getting very large salaries for their people, without any special training.

Okay, now, if we have limited funds, the state's income is going to be limited, the cost of operating the universities is going to be higher and higher, maintenance is higher, the salaries go higher, and when you don't hire any new people, salary steps go up and you find that salaries for faculty is higher and higher, because everybody's in a higher bracket. So one of the real problems at the University is: What do we do about increasing longevity in faculty with higher salaries and raises, and with no new blood coming in? This is why I raised the question of should we continue to give tenure to everybody with a profession at the University?

Have they ever given tenure to everyone?

Practically everyone. The way it is now, if you're a professional at the University and if you don't get tenure that sixth year, in the seventh year you're out. It's either up or Out. There's no other way about it. And the regents, themselves, are kind of at fault for that because we accepted the idea of tenure. Tenure was originally based on the idea that we would lose some of our good faculty. Our good faculty would be persecuted because they expressed themselves. It was tied in with academic freedom.

And there still are some areas that need to be protected that way. But it's not any real big problem any more. The institution itself, the university, will protect its people, make sure that they have a right to be protected against being fired. The regents will make sure that that doesn't happen. And besides that, no

matter what area of endeavor you are in if you work for the state or if you're in a political subdivision and you get fired, it had better be justified after you've been there a while. Even a fireman or a policeman or even, you know, slightly trained people can't be fired without just cause.

Did the same rules apply then to faculty people?

Well, that's different. But I'm saying that the tenure as such is not necessary. Now, I would like to refer to the text of my talk that I gave to the regents last winter; I believe it was in February, at the February meeting. And I don't know if it's necessary to put all that on the tape. But that does say a lot of these things.

Would you like that reproduced as part of your script?

Yeah, if you can do that.

This started out now—as a matter of explanation, this started out to be a report of a meeting that happened in Atlanta, Georgia in October. But it ended up that it's more than that; it contains a lot of my own ideas, a lot of ideas that we've been talking about in many of the meetings. It's designed to get the regents and the administration to take another look at what we're doing in higher education. So I'll give you that.

* * * * *

We (Regents members who attended Carnegie Commission on Higher Education meeting) were warned of three serious problems that regents must meet over the next decade. These problems have been brought about by decreasing enrollments, coupled with a decline in

the rate of financial backing from state and federal sources. We don't have adequate financing to keep up with the need to meet increasing costs of operation. Salary scales are designed to increase with length of service and with promotions. All of our faculty can conceivably be on the upper end of the scale as time goes by—surely 80 per cent of them will be.

Thus even with no growth in numbers our cost of basic salaries will continue to grow. With our present commitments on fringe benefits and other operative costs the cost picture becomes even more startling.

Obviously, the role of regents and administrators will include selling the legislature and the public on increased needs for public funds, even though we will have decreased enrollments. What then will our fiscal policy be in the future? We have been taught to project the future on increased annual enrollment figures—now the situation is reversed.

Eighty per cent of our faculty are going to be tenured faculty—the universities cannot live in a vacuum. We must have new blood—new ideas—and exchange of culture and all of the other attributes of a dynamic up-to-date educational system.

We have been measuring success of our universities by input. We assume that well paid professors with tenure, fine expensive facilities, good public relations and excellent financial backing is bound to produce excellent, successful graduates.

It is time that we do some measuring by output. Do our professors really get the truth across

to their students? Is a four-year stay in college really beneficial to a young adult? The era of unquestioned faith in higher education has passed. The people are no longer enamored by a college degree per se.

When we grant tenure to a professor, do we also invite him to become so-called "Dead Wood"? I have had professors tell me how little challenge there is in teaching some of the required courses semester after semester.

The fear of being stymied by a faculty that is 80 to 95 per cent tenured with no new people coming in is very real in most colleges and universities. At present our projections indicate that the University of Nevada System will be an exception, because of the growth of our state. In preparing this report, I looked back in my files to 1968, we were told then that by 1980, there would be 30,000 students in our two Universities. There were supposed to be 15,000 here at the University of Las Vegas by now. All universities were projecting growth by looking backward to see what happened and predicting that the future would reflect that growth.

Tenure was conceived as a means to protect faculty who had views and ideas that didn't fit the present philosophy. Universities and governing boards recognized that the success of new ideas depended upon the right to express them for often the public rejects not only the ideas but the people who had them—thus stifling progress.

Tenure as a means to assure academic freedom was a great idea

and has been proven to do just that for some of our professors. It is ironic that it is also tenure that is worrying those of us in university government today because it is actually impeding progress, first by guaranteeing jobs to all professors after one review and approval of tenure and secondly by stymieing non-tenured faculty because they could be stopped from getting tenure by their tenured colleagues.

Today tenure has become a right to hold a job even stronger than collective bargaining. We have been measuring the excellence of our Universities and colleges by using the wrong tools. When a problem comes up we answer it by financing a new building; too often we pay more attention to the architecture and design of the outside of the building than we do to its usability and effectiveness. Or we answer the problem by raising the salary of the faculty, dean or president or all of these.

Regents generally are frustrated because there seems to be no way to measure incompetence because of the intangible results. For example, it is not a rarity to have a student complain about a professor during college days and years later praise him. The third concern of regents isn't generally recognized, even by regents themselves. It concerns the quality of those responsible for higher education and their ability to function. I have said this many times and it certainly bears repeating.

"We have two responsibilities—first to set policy and keep it up-

to-date and second to hire and fire presidents.” Admittedly this simplifies our responsibilities but it also serves to keep us on the right tracks. We should not get involved in day to day decisions that should be made by our administrators.

Nationally governing boards have given up too many of their rights and responsibilities. In the 1920s and '30s they transferred them to presidents and administrators. In the '40s and '50s they transferred the responsibilities and rights to the faculty; in the '60s and early '70s they transferred them to the students.

Today we are faced with a dilemma—We have probably already gone too far in delegating decision making and responsibility. How can we retrieve some of the powers vested in governing boards and still make good use of the input of students, faculty and administrators? What should our relationship with our presidents be? I have been a regent for 11 years—during that short space of time we have had 23 dedicated people serve on the board for varied lengths of time. Two were removed by death, only one by defeat in election, and two by reapportionment. Nine elected to quit. Why?

Too many of us never really recognized and accepted his or her role as a regent. Sometimes because the tenure was too short, but too often because they just didn't give the time or could not afford the price to be paid. Eventually (usually too soon), the sacrifice becomes too great.

Our priority problems then are: tenure, board-President relationships

and fiscal policies and I would add Productivity. Productivity could be regarded as a key word for the decade ahead.

Here are some ideas that provide food for thought. Dr. Anderson stole part of my thunder with his requests for task forces. Regents can and have the responsibility to look carefully at what the public gets for its tax dollars. Then we need to insist that steps be taken to set up goals for professionals to meet. We need to establish realistic measurements of output. I recognize that some professors carry unbelievable loads—I also recognize that some teachers don't teach and productivity is almost nil. Some areas such as in the Medical School we need a ratio of almost one to one. In others the ratio can be as high as 100 to one. How then do we establish measurements with credibility? And how do we set up machinery to hire and keep good faculty and weed out the non-productive faculty?

Ben Rusche, a trustee from South Carolina questions tenure and any good that it does. He based much of his comments on the publication, *Faculty Tenure*, by Jossey, Bass Publishers, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco 94111. He says if tenure is a right then much of the necessity to have collective bargaining is eliminated. Tenure neither guarantees nor enhances academic freedom. It does provide economic security; even without productivity. Tenure then is not essential to provide academic freedom; it is really assured by the institution and by the legal

guarantees provided all United States citizens.

I truly believe that we would be doing a service to the university and its faculty and students to abolish tenure as such and replace it with a more realistic way to recognize productivity. Perhaps we could limit tenure to those few professors that are so important that we cannot do without them; then have their performance be reviewed by new output standards every five or seven years if results are bad give the professor two years to change. If no change is made his contract should be terminated. Sound harsh and unreal? That is not my intent. Good, productive faculty have nothing to fear. We will want them, need them and take care of them. I am afraid we are getting our priorities mixed up. The university is not for the benefit of the faculty and employees—it is for the benefit of the students—who will become alumni—who will enter our society—and who should benefit all of that society. Why don't we reverse some of our procedures?

Minnesota asked the legislature what they could spend—then fit expenditures to it. We need to examine expenditure limits and really assume the responsibility to see to it that the public gets results for its tax dollars.

Let us determine the mission of higher education today—that is what Dr. Anderson asks for in setting up task forces. We need to be aware of changing aspirations. We need to be aware of changing requirements from our society.

Are our building programs priorities right? Can they be re-evaluated and improved? Are we

asking the necessary questions of costs— Are the buildings to provide facilities or to fill a dream?

Are our programs right—old and new? You all know the questions and the problems. We need to take time to ponder problems, to get to know our faculty, our universities and colleges.

Regents must become advocates—defend and push for our programs—not apologize. We should make public appearances at service clubs, associations and other groups. We need to make these appearances productive—not only do we air our problems publicly, but we should seek ideas and suggestions from people generally outside education circles.

It is up to us, the regents, to tell Congress and the legislature what we think the problems are and what can and should be done because we know it best. We should spend time with legislators and decision makers so they really understand our problems—recognize what our aims for higher education really are. When we need their backing, we will get it because they recognize the need.

I have served on this board for 11 years. I am in my fourth year as chairman of the board. I recognize that it takes real dedication to be a good regent. I believe as many others in the United States that regents should be compensated. Many advocate that the chairman be salaried. I recognize that we need to spend more time being involved—doing the things I have mentioned but it is only right that we be compensated for it. The fact is many of us just can't afford to do what should be done.

You suggested that we talk a little bit about how the students were concerned about the control of student funds. I'd like to point out that this all came to a head last year when we were down in Las Vegas and there was a raid made, a drug raid made on the campus. And a group of, I don't know, a half dozen or so university students were arrested, for having drugs and selling drugs, and whatever they did, and marijuana, and so forth. And the next day, the student body president and a couple of other people took it upon themselves to take all of the student funds available and go down and deposit bail for those people. And it was criticized immediately by the students. Now, they said, "Well, who was in charge?" and, "How can you veto?" There was no veto power. Well, actually I think there was a veto power but we weren't paying any attention to it.

So, then immediately, the regents got concerned. And they asked the chancellor and the deputy attorney general, Procter Hug, our counsel, to find out what could be done. And so they came up with the recommendations that the student body funds be recognized as—just like they would in any other department—as part of the funds that we are in control of, as the Board of Regents. And so when they did that, they were subject then to a final approval by a high officer. And we suggested that for the students, instead of going to the chancellor, that they would finally have to be approved by the president of that particular campus. And the students thought maybe we'd gone a step too far.

They agreed with most of the things we said in that recommendation. But they felt that we'd gone too far by saying that everything had to be approved. So we changed that. The change was so that they would be checked out to see if they could legally do it. But they would still have to go through the president. So this still gives us a check and balance that

we wanted and it was a happy compromise as far as the students were concerned.

The students on the Reno campus were upset because they felt that they had a well established business operation and had always been trustworthy.

Actually, the compromise left it the way we wanted it anyhow. It's just a different way of saying it.

Do you want to spell it out?

Well, I'm just saying that we wanted a check and balance. The University Board of Regents is responsible for funds that are collected from students for the operation. We're ultimately responsible for it. And so with any other arm of the University, it finally has to come to a top officer for final approval. That's all we wanted; we wanted check and balance on there. And we don't really worry about what the students do; that's their decision unless they do something that's as asinine as what they did to bail those kids out. That was a mistake and very few student body presidents would have done that. But it did happen and it could happen again so we want to protect the student fees.

Somebody said, well, that's a method, a learning method. And to me, it really isn't a learning method. You know, the way you learn is that you operate financially—you have good fiscal policies, a double check on where the money comes from and where it goes, and see to it that it's spent in a manner that it's intended to be spent.

Another point that's kind of important. In fact, it's so important that we're spending a lot of our time—we're having administration spend a lot of time, and this is mostly on the

Reno campus—is, what are we going to do about our dormitories? We have Nye Hall which has a very large debt. It has to be retired, and it has to be retired by income from the use of Nye Hall, renting out the rooms, and by having the students eat in the Dining Commons. Now, that's not the only one. All of them have some indebtedness, except the old ones. And so we have to have an income coming in to retire the indebtedness and cost of operation and to keep those buildings there.

Now, I have asked, more than once, probably half a dozen times, that we come up with some other ideas on how we could do that. Other uses of the dormitories. One of 'em we're talking about is for some retired people. Now, another one was that we would put the student infirmary there, have a sort of small hospital in Juniper Hall. We talked about taking White Pine Hall and making that into apartments for married students. And we talked about maybe putting classrooms in some of the other parts of the buildings. But so far, none of these seem to be feasible.

We did, however, decide that we would quit running the food service ourselves. And we lost. When we did it, they took it to court and we lost. The judge, Emile Gezelin, died the next day after he gave his ruling. So we had no chance to go back and talk to him about it or appeal it. And we had to wait a year. And then it was taken back to another judge and we won the case. We're now able to contract out the food services. And we get private enterprise involved. That's the right way to do it. We're going to get better service, because there are companies—quite a few of them now—that will bid on them. We've been using the one down in Las Vegas right along. And they'll bid on the student services and we'll have better food. The one we were going to give the contract to last year is the same

one that provides the food over at College Inn. And they'll probably bid on it again. But whoever it is, they'll provide a better food service and 20 meals per week instead of the present 15 meals per week and therefore, it'll be more attractive to the students.

Now, the other thing we ran into was, we had a certain debt to pay. We had a small percentage—we didn't have full capacity to fill it up—so we had smaller number of people paying for the indebtedness. We had to raise the rates. Now, on top of that, we had to raise the charges for the food, and on top of that, we only fed them five days a week. And to me, there was a good reason for the students to complain (although they didn't complain about it) because the ones who were there were stuck with it. Now, with having won that suit, we're going to be able to meet it. And also we'll have the students involved, and the faculty, and we're coming up with some other ideas.

I noticed you got down here, "faculty concerns" on your suggestions. They've always had a dues checkoff for withholding dues for some—or not always, but for a long, long time—for the people who belong to the NSEA, Nevada State Employees Association. And when they came in with the union for the faculty, they asked to have dues check-off. That was in 1972. And so we said okay, we'd do that, but that would automatically expire in June of 1973. And at the same time, all dues check-off s would automatically expire. And so when the time came for it to expire, the faculty came back and asked for dues check-off.

And we felt that what we were really doing was helping the faculty to organize against the University operation. If they needed a union, then they should be able to collect their own dues. And so that was the way it was voted—most of the regents voted that way—and we

didn't let them do it. Then we let it die in June, and then later on, like August, or September, it was brought back and we voted again. And this time, we voted to allow it to go back the way it was before. Those belonging to NSEA can have dues check-off but not the faculty members.

Had you ever ruled against JAUP being— well, it was just all dues wasn't it?

AAUP is not the strongest one any more, though. The [National Society for Professors], NSP, they have about eighty members up here. And they have another twenty otherwise.

It's a new organization.

But it's probably the strongest one now, because they're very vocal. They have a hired man named Richard Morgan, you know. He works for the—it's the same organization as school teachers organized.

Now, let's talk about this a little bit. Because during the last session of the legislature, which I had mentioned on the last [1972-73] tape, we almost had a bill put in saying how we would organize and how the people could organize, and how they would actively organize. There were three choices. One of them was that they would be able to strike, and one of them was that they would have what they called binding arbitration and the third one was where they meet and confer. That's short, for what was really there. The faculty, of course, wanted the binding arbitration. We felt that we'd like to have the "meet and confer" but we would accept the right to strike.

Now, something's going to happen in the next session of the legislature. What'll happen I don't know, but there's going to be a bill come through there and it will allow the faculty to organize, it'll tell 'em how they can organize,

and so forth. So there'll probably be some compromises come out of that. I don't know what the story'll be.

Last winter, I think about January, Dr. Fred Anderson after studying the Carnegie report, felt that maybe we ought to have task forces to study some of the problems, some of the six problems that were pointed out by the Carnegie Commission [on Higher Education]. And about half of the regents were for it. In fact, the first time that we talked about it there were five out of nine that voted to go ahead and have the task forces. But as we discussed it with the faculty and with the regents, we decided that wasn't the right way to do it. So we gave up the idea of task forces.

What we're doing now instead, is going back to the same thing that we've always done. We have an idea, we send it back to the faculty and ask them to study it, make some recommendations, and so forth.

This is through their senate committees?

Senate committees, their own committees—they have task forces and so forth that they appoint. For example, they have one on tenure. We recognize a problem, we send it back to them. They can recognize a problem and bring it up to us, it can go either way. It's a two-way street. This is probably still the best way. The only thing is, I think that the regents were not getting involved enough in it. See, I feel very strongly that the regents have abdicated some of the powers that they should be exercising. And the reason for that was that somebody else was willing to do it; and the regents in those days were willing to let them. In other words, the faculty was willing to make some of those decisions and do some of those studies and make some recommendations, and we were willing to let them go ahead and do it.

In that talk that I made to the regents, the newspapers carried the fact that I suggested that we could probably do away with tenure and get along just as well without it. But there were a lot of other suggestions in there. There's a lot of other suggestions in what we ought to do. And one of 'em was that the regents take another look at what they've given up, let somebody else do. In the 19-, oh, I suppose in the '30's, '40's, and '50's, along in there, they let the faculty take over. The regents met about twice a year, and it was an honor to be a regent, and they came in and voted any changes that the president recommended at that particular time or that the president recommended at that particular time or that the faculty recommended, and they approved the bills and went home. They were happy.

But while this was happening, the faculties then started getting involved—and this was all over the United States. The faculties started getting involved and they started putting some input into it. And they made some of the decisions, and they asked for some powers and we gave it to them—the regents gave it to them. Then the '60's and '70's came along, well, at least the '60's and early '70's came along, and the students came in and asked for some power, and the regents gave it to them. Now, I think it's time for us to look and see if we didn't give away too much power.

One of the reasons for this is that regents are not paid. And it's no longer a twice a year, four times a year, meeting thing; it's a full involvement. For example, the last three months, I've put in at least half of my time as a regent, as chairman of the Board. Because I went to all of the commencements. I made talks at events like the Phi Kappa Phi dinner, the Home Economics honorary society, you know, all these different organizations, all involved with the University. I also made talks at service clubs, and I have gone to the tenure

committee meetings. This sort of thing goes on all the time. And the chairman is pretty much involved.

At several of the meetings that I've been to, including one I just went to the other day,* they suggested the chairman of the Board be paid, fulltime. I think maybe that's too much, I think he ought to be paid some, so that at least it doesn't cost him that much. Because he's going to have a hard time getting good people to be that dedicated. I'm a dedicated person. I've been dedicated to my University, but after twelve years of dedication with no reimbursement at all, I just can't afford to keep on being that dedicated to it. There have been many— during the twelve years I was on the Board there were twenty-three regents. And there's only nine of 'em left. The rest of 'em quit or died—two of them died— and the rest of 'em just didn't run for reelection. There was only one that wasn't reelected. And he turned around and ran again and was elected again. So it wasn't because the people didn't want them, it was because they didn't get that involved in the University. Either they got disinterested because they weren't involved, or else they saw where they could do some other things and get paid for it. So I think that the regents should receive some remuneration. So that they would be able to sit down and really get the grasp of what the mission of higher education is.

I'll tell you a little bit about this meeting I went to. I was selected as one of thirty people in the Southwest and invited to Pasadena to go to a seminar. Our chancellor was also

*I was invited along with 30 Board Chairmen and University Presidents and Chancellors to discuss the future of higher education in the U.S.A. The meeting was sponsored by AGB and held in Pasadena.

invited but he had a conflict and couldn't be there, because President Milam was here at the same time. But I went and there were the presidents of quite a few of the California universities, the Chairman of the Board of Regents from California, and the Chairman from Arizona, was there. Plus quite a few of the chairmen from the community colleges. There were thirty people, limited to thirty people, and these thirty people talked, well, they just rolled up their sleeves and said, "Let's talk about what the problems are." And one of the problems that kept coming back was that we the Regents are not involved enough in what's going on in the university.

Now, some of the regents that have been around a long time still say that the mission of higher education is *to impart knowledge*. Well, I think that's great, but it's too philosophical, and I don't think it'll work in these times. I think the mission of the university is to develop responsible young people who are able to go out and compete, and that can provide leadership to our country.

People who can have the kind of training that will help them to make the necessary decisions, help them to think, and help them to know where to go when they don't have the information that's necessary.

So that's a lot bigger order than just saying to them, "We're going to give you the knowledge and you figure out what to do with it." The old idea of having the professor on one end of the log and a student on the other one, to me is wrong, out of style. I think you need more. It's been proven. And that's another reason I think, I've mentioned a little earlier that there were not enough graduates that were employable so they could make more money, or at least as much money as the one who got out of high school and went to work as truck drivers, and so forth. And the reason for that is, they got a lot of knowledge, but it

wasn't practical enough; you couldn't apply it to anything. So I think that the mission of higher education should be to provide—and I don't want to do away with the liberal arts altogether, but I think we should have more professional schools, we should provide people to be architects and lawyers, and people who can fit into special categories, insurance men, real estate people, whatever is necessary in our way of life today.

We should also in higher education take care of that other twenty-five to thirty-five percent of our population who aren't qualified, or don't want to, have no desire to go to college. And we do that through community college.

Our community college system has been highly successful. We had 2,000 full-time students this year in Western Nevada Community College. And there's that many down in Las Vegas. And about 150 to 200 up in Elko; I'm not sure just exactly. But about 5,000 FTE students in the Community College. And this was all done (with the exception of Elko) without any buildings, you know, without any facilities, and we'd beg, borrow, and steal the equipment that we used. Now, this year, we'll have a building—a building that cost about a million, four hundred thousand dollars in North Las Vegas. And we'll have a building that cost almost \$900,000 here in Carson City. And that'll be the first two buildings on these other campuses. We have in the mill another building for Las Vegas and we have one to go into Reno. So we're going to have more facilities, and we are going to be taking care of that segment of our population that doesn't have a means to get education beyond high school.

I have gone to several seminars this year, probably a half a dozen of them where we discussed the idea of carrying through with the high schools in doing a little bit more

training, preparing the people for the world of work, getting them started with counseling and advice on which way they should go, earlier. We would exchange ideas with the high schools on what we would like them to do, and they would tell us where we should be taking up after they leave off—that sort of thing. And this is going to be very good for education. I think we waste a lot of time educating people, and not spending enough time training them to do anything specific. (And I know there are other sides to that argument.)

It's hard to assess our new president, Max Milam, at the University of Nevada, Reno. I think it's easy to assess Dr. Baepler in Las Vegas. He's done a great job. He has great faculty relationships. He's a man of vision, and he works very hard. And he will provide the kind of leadership we need in our newer campus in Las Vegas. We're very pleased to have him as the president, and we're looking forward to seeing a lot of things happen that were not happening as fast as they should have been in prior years. He has been acting president for almost a year now, and now is a full-time president. And he's provided leadership, he is respected by the community, and he's also respected by the faculty and the students. He fits right into the category.

Max Milam, on the other hand, is a different sort of a person. My judgment is that, because of his administration background, because of the fact that he's involved in the government, because he was in business, and because he's also been a political scientist in his academic role, he's going to be a man that—well, he *is* a man that has very broad background. He understands the thinking. He doesn't come on strong, as the big salesman type; he comes on with the inquisitive, sharp mind. He wants to find out what the problems are before he makes any recommendations.

I'm going to be surprised if he doesn't provide the kind of leadership we need here. We do need a good administrator. And I think it's worked out fine that we bring in a man from off campus, because I expect to see a lot of changes made with the way the operation is at this University.

I haven't really discussed these problems in detail with him. I spent about two hours with him last week. But I will do that before I get off the Board. I am sure that the faculty and the students are going to accept him. I think he's just an excellent choice.

It's hard to explain why we selected a certain person. He was one of three recommended and he fitted what we wanted better than the other two. But they were all good men. He's got a good record. He's been the budget officer for the state of Arkansas for four years. And Winthrop Rockefeller thought enough of him to leave him in charge of his affairs when he died, so he had good experience. So that should prove that he's a good man.

The Board of Regents in Nevada has always, I believe, been pretty representative of the people, because of the fact it's an elected board. And even though years ago, there were four of them in Reno and only one like in Elko or somewhere, Ely, it was still a representative board, because that's where most of the people lived in those days, and that's where higher education was. And there wasn't any real reason for bringing somebody in from a long ways away to be a regent. And then as the concept of higher education grew, and the one-man-one-vote idea came into effect, we reapportioned the Board of Regents, set it up so that small counties would have some members and Clark County would have some members and Washoe County would have members. The last reapportionment set it up so that there would be five from Clark

County. That's over half of the board, but over half of the population of the state live in Las Vegas. There'll be one from eastern Nevada, which is presently composed of Elko and all of the counties in northeastern Nevada; that's probably the smallest in numbers of people. Then the other one that I represent is Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County, Pershing, Storey and Churchill counties. There are two regents from Reno-Washoe County. And the other five come from districts in Las Vegas, Clark County, rather.

Okay, when you have an election like that, you can't just sit down and say, okay, we want to elect one person as a black, one as a Chicano, one who is a lawyer, one who is a labor man, and one who is an educator, one who is a student, and so forth. You can't really do that. I'm not sure that that's the answer anyhow. That's one of the things we discussed at that seminar I went to down there, was the makeup of boards. And it was finally decided that just because you're a member of a minority, doesn't mean that you necessarily represent that minority best. It was also pointed out though just about as strongly is that because someone happens to be in office for a long period of time, he thinks he knows all the answers, he doesn't really represent the minority list either. So there's some kind of a happy medium. And in an election, you end up generally with a pretty representative group of people.

There were two problems that I saw during my time on the Board. And one of them is the term of office was only for four years. That's being rectified, they're now being elected for six years; with nine members, you get three new members every two years. And that way, you have a holdover [of] two thirds of the board.

That doesn't always work out, because right at this point in time, we had two of our

regents die of cancer shortly after they were elected, Paul McDermott and Flora Dungan. And so we had regents appoint to fill out their terms, complete their terms. And those people came up for election, balance of those terms. Plus that, in this changeover the one from Elko or that area, eastern Nevada, will be elected for a six-year term, the one from my district here will be elected for a two-year term. But in two years from now, everybody will be on the six-year term. And there will be three of them up for six years.

Who's going to be the chairman? I don't know. That's an important part of any board, is the chairmanship of the board. We have our own by-laws that a chairman can only be elected once and then reelected once. In other words, we can serve four years. And then he can be off for a while and then be reelected to the board. Which is probably a good idea because the past showed the chairman got on there too long and he ended up running out of new ideas. So a new chairman can bring some vitality and new thoughts to the board. I would assume that the new chairman will probably come from Las Vegas. I'm just saying that because they haven't had a chairman there for a while. And they have five regents down there and if some of the present regents get back why, there'll be several people who'll be eligible for it. But that's not necessarily so. It could be—Fred Anderson could be chairman again, because even though he's served once, he's eligible again.

The faculty have been involved in all of our budget-making process. But they were disappointed this last time, felt that they maybe weren't involved as much as they wanted to be, and so they've taken a little bit more time and they've set up a special committee. And that's the [institutional studies and budget]. So we're talking about maybe a new way of deciding how our budget

should be worked up, and maybe involving more of the factors of production.

Certainly the regents (and I especially) feel that our measurements of how good we've done with our dollar aren't too good. That's not going to sound so good, but what I'm saying is that we have been measuring our success by how many dollars we spend. We get testimony from faculty, and from administration, and so forth that they need more money, that they are not doing as good as they want to do, their production isn't as good as they want to. So we say, okay, what we'll do then is spend some more money, we'll provide fine buildings for you, and excellent facilities, and raise the salaries, and then assume—we have assumed—that that is the way to increase the production of education. And it's not really the right way to do it. I think what we ought to do is get some ways of evaluating our professors, who are now tenured. We evaluate them before they get tenure and after that, we forget about it. I think we should find a way where we can measure their success, and we measure them every five years or something like that.

Some departments evaluate their own people quite strictly.

Not as well as I would like to see them evaluated. They never sit in on each others' classes, they evaluate them by hearsay, more than they do the way that I think they ought to be evaluated. I think that a professor should be pleased to have somebody come in and sit in on his classes once in a while. And I think he should be pleased to go sit in on somebody else's classes. And the department heads. That's a good way of evaluating. The students are getting involved in evaluating.

I think the one that we've missed out on [is that] we have had no way of finding out

what these students did after they got out of school. We can't check with the alumni and find out how successful our University is. And that's the real reason for a university. And I've said this many times. I think that we've lost sight of the purpose of the university. The reason for having a university, whether it be a community college or a four-year university, is the students. We're there to provide a way for them to better themselves, as I said a little while ago, so that they could become leaders, so they could do a job that needs to be done in leading the country, providing leadership, and keeping up with our times. And the way we do that is to give them the knowledge that's available to them, and help them to study, and then measure to see if we worked it out. And not just assume that—.

What we would like to do is to have it so that we could check after students have been out in the world, five or six or eight or ten years, and find out really how successful they are. We know that all of our students don't stay in the same field as they were educated in. And we know that they don't all go on to be doctors and lawyers, further their education. We know that they get into industry and the professions. Some of them are successful (that we hear about). Some of them we don't ever—we call them "lost alumni." We don't know where they are, how they did. So we need to measure them, we need them to come back and tell us what they got out of school. I know from my own thoughts that if I had to evaluate some of my professors back when I was in college, they might have been evaluated very highly; ten years later or five years later, I would have evaluated them very lowly, on the opposite end of the spectrum. And it's also true that you may have evaluated a person as not a very good teacher while you were in school, and then when you get out, you realized that he really gave something to you,

that part of your success is because of what you got from that particular professor. So that's probably the biggest area of evaluation.

Now, I want to say one more thing on this tenure thing. I believe that we could limit the number of people who'd receive tenure to maybe forty percent of the faculty. And they would be in the areas where you need to have tenure. The rest of the faculty would be on renewable contracts, like five years. But review and then renew. They never really get tenure, but also they're not to be fired because of the way they thought, and so forth. This is the sort of thing, recommendation, I hope comes out of the two committees.

Now, we didn't get as good cooperation in Las Vegas as we did in Reno. Reno, the tenure committee, they invited the president in, I was invited in, the chancellor was invited in, a lot of people have been brought in with different ideas, and they are actually trying to come up with some good, solid recommendations. We should have those by this fall. But in Las Vegas, they won't even have their committee going until September. So I'm hoping that we'll get some recommendations before I go off the Board, in January.

And I would like the opportunity next year to look back and kind of review. I would do it with some thought, instead of just doing what we're doing today because I'm sure we're missing some of the ideas that I had.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSORS

JAMES T. RICHARDSON, PRESIDENT

James T. Richardson: Well, first of all, I would like to comment a little on my experiences as president of the NSP chapter this year, and explain a little bit about what NSP is doing at UNR and throughout the system so that readers can understand a little bit better what's happening.

This year has been kind of an interim year for NSP chapters in system, in that we were not successful in getting a good collective bargaining bill in the last session of the legislature. So we have been more [or] less treading water waiting for the next session of the legislature. But interestingly enough, it's been an extremely busy year, and an exciting year, much to the surprise of some of us. At the time we didn't get the collective bargaining legislation we wanted, many of us were disappointed, but felt we should maintain the organization because there are a lot of other services that NSP offers to the University faculty member. So we did, in fact go—as I may have mentioned last year—to the NSEA state convention and requested a dues reduction for this year so that we could be helped and

maintain our membership. They were very gracious and supportive and allowed us to lower our total dues to forty dollars for this year, twenty-five for the national and fifteen for the state organization and five for the local. Using that dues structure throughout the system, we have increased our membership nearly twofold this year, during an off year in the legislative session. [We] now have groups of faculty at all five campuses, the three community colleges and the two universities. We have over seventy members at UNR and the membership at UNLV is up to over forty now, even though their president had a heart attack and was incapacitated for two or three months in terms of his ability to organize. There are two official chapters at the community colleges that are quite strong: Northern Nevada and Western Nevada Community Colleges. The Clark County Community College group is growing I understand. And they have about half the faculty signed up, although they're not an officially recognized chapter affiliated with NSEA yet. I anticipate that this will take place in the very near future.

In terms of why we've had this growth, I think faculties have begun to realize that there are a number of other issues that independent faculty groups can get involved with, and that there are in fact a number of things that NSP chapters or groups like them can do. And I want to talk about some of those things, because that in fact is what has contributed to this being an exciting year. One thing we've done very deliberately, although not with the kind of conspiracy that some would credit us with, is to get very involved in University affairs in terms of committees, the senate, and other presidential committees and what not. I don't think it's possible in fact to go down the list of senate committees or presidentially appointed committees without finding at least one if not more NSP members on each of these committees. Another way of saying that is that the NSP membership tends to be a very active membership and many, if not most of the most active faculty members in terms of University affairs, are members of NSP. If you check the minutes of the senate, for instance, and you know who the members of NSP are, you realize for instance that most of the motions and seconds in the senate are made by people who are members of NSP.

That should not be interpreted to say that NSP has taken over the senate, by any means. It should be interpreted to mean that faculty members are concerned about things and are working in a number of different ways to accomplish them. So just about any time you see a committee meeting, you see NSP represented. That includes the presidential selection committee. There were at least two NSP members on that, for instance. That was a subject of some controversy, I understand, at least for a time, in that apparently some people on the committee felt that by virtue of being NSP members, that meant they were reporting to us and taking orders from us which was,

of course, ridiculous. That would be a little like saying because I'm a member of the Soc department and I serve on a committee, I report back to the Soc department, even though things are confidential. The point is, we do serve on a lot of campus groups and have been very involved in campus affairs and have been a strong voice in this fairly subtle fashion for faculty rights. And we've helped contribute to the strength of the senate, for instance. The senate has been extremely active this year, has met at least twenty-five times, and have taken on a lot of issues that heretofore senates have shied away from. And when you've got about a third of the senate that's members of NSP, you see this sort of thing happening.

Also, NSP has worked in a very explicit fashion on two or three ad hoc operations this year that I think are worth mentioning. Last May and June, that is May and June of '73, we and the senate joined together with AAUP to try to fight the work program that President Miller was presenting and we were very near successful in getting it stopped. The vote of the Board of Regents was five to three, as I may have reported last year. But that was really the first time that we had an ad hoc grouping of the three most important faculty organizations. Since that time, we have continued to work together on budget matters.

We have also, however, come together on two other issues in establishing, through the senate, ad hoc committees made up explicitly of representatives of these three groups. One of these involves personnel cases. There've been a number of very difficult personnel cases on campus this year, and I'll comment in more detail on some of those later. Some of them have come before the senate and NSP at the same time. And we have recommended a continued joint effort in an attempt to present

a unified front to the administration. And this has contributed to the settling of at least one very difficult personnel case this year. And we've worked in more informal fashion on some others together with the senate, and some of them have been settled. There are others that are not settled, some extremely trying ones, and we're working together on them.

The explicit thing that we did was set up an ad hoc group to try to gather funds for some of these cases. And while this mechanism has not been put into operation, we've—since we've been trying to settle some of the cases on an informal basis, I'm convinced that it'll just be a matter of days literally until we do have a solicitation of funds by this joint committee to support lawsuits against the administration. Which will be another first.

Ruth G. Hilts: Is that made up of Senate, NSP, and AAUP?

Right. AAUP's involvement is in a sense always more of a courtesy gesture, to be honest. (I'm a member of AAUP, also.) But they have not been very active in University affairs, don't have much of a presence. But any time we do this sort of thing it seems to everyone's advantage to have a unified front. And interestingly enough, NSP has given AAUP as much coverage as they've sought for themselves this past year, by recommending that they be brought into such groups.

Another place where there's been an ad hoc coming together of these three groups is in their collective bargaining. The senate has voted to have a discussion and vote among the faculty about some issues concerning collective bargaining in the next session of the legislature. There will be enabling legislation introduced, at least from NSEA, if not from the administration again. This legislation

would allow collective bargaining in higher education. And it was felt by many that there should be some input from faculty as a whole in the acceptance of the bill. And so even this week, a questionnaire's being circulated to faculty. And the questionnaire was put together by a joint group of AAUP, NSP and the senate, so that it would not appear a biased kind of thing. Hopefully we'll have some results in a few weeks that can be used in testimony about the collective bargaining bills that come before the legislature. (I'll talk some more about the collective bargaining in a moment, perhaps.) Those are the key things that we have done this year in NSP.

I think I should give more detail about particularly collective bargaining and the personnel problems that have come up, for the record. Quickly, on collective bargaining we have sought NSEA support at their convention recently in Tonopah, to again put in a bill that would allow collective bargaining in higher education. And, of course, they would be working for a reasonable, workable bill for us.

We do this—we work with them as I've said in previous interviews—because they are a very influential state lobby group. And our working with them—that is NSEA—has all public education in Nevada in a unified stance. In years past, we've had some severe problems in that they have the best lobbyist in the state in the person of Dick Morgan, and he's been able to get money out of the University budget for the K through 12 teachers. And if we accomplish nothing else by our actions, hopefully that will cease. In '71, for instance, he got a very large chunk of our budget after the Governor had actually made his recommendation. And that's one of the reasons we've got such severe financial problems, is the successful lobbying effort of the NSEA.

Well, now we're working with them and we got an explicit commitment at the last convention that they will support funding efforts for the University. So we've got a unified public education front going in this state that I think will be extremely valuable. (There's nothing better than having groups that have to go to the same funding trough fighting one another for the money. A governor loves that kind of situation, because he can always blame some other group.) And if we can stay together, then I think it will mean more for education throughout the state.

We are interested in K through 12 education and they're interested in our education. You could cite a number of specific issues, but in general we're all concerned about the same kinds of things. So we're interested in also having the same privilege that NSEA's school teachers have in terms of collective bargaining. It's apparent that after the next session of the legislature, if we don't get this right to collectively bargain, we will be the only group of public employees without it. The state classified people are definitely going to seek a bill. Everyone else already has a bill, county employees, city employees, policemen, firemen, school teachers. And I think that's a very disadvantageous position for higher education to be in.

There's not a ground swell of sympathy for higher education in the first place. And if you get these powerful lobbies talking to legislature members, and we don't have someone down there, like Dick Morgan, we're in trouble. And that could be interpreted as a negative critique of the previous lobbying efforts of our administration. I'm fairly open about the fact that at least in past years, the lobbying effort has been ineffectual. I happen to know that from personal experience, from meeting and talking with a number of legislature members. And we just need

help. It's not something that one person like President Miller or Neil Humphrey can do by themselves; they need a lot of help.

In the last session, help was given by a group that was put together by the chancellor to go help in the lobbying effort. And it was successful. It gained some money that we weren't going to get otherwise. And I think it'll be even stronger in the coming year, if we can have the system administration supported by NSEA in our funding efforts.

Particularly, I would suggest that some very restrictive legislation in terms of how we spend our funds could be taken care of by this such joint effort. In the public schools, money can be carried over from year to year and it makes for an efficient operation. You don't rush around spending money on June 30, just so you don't have to give it back to the treasury of the state. In the University, however, it doesn't work that way; you do in fact have to remit any funds, which means we lose any potential salary savings, not to mention any other thing.

Now, the library usually benefits from this kind of thing, because that's something—you know, you can have book orders ready and if there's any money left, you buy the books on June 30, and commit all those funds. I happen to like the library, but I'd just as soon have them have more flexibility with what they do with that money, and not just have to spend money. That's an inefficient way to run an operation. We would like to get that law changed and also provisions that require that we spend state money last, which makes it probably even worse. I understand that we have to spend student money and that kind of funding first, and use state appropriated money last, so that if any money is left over it's state money which reverts to the treasury. So I hope we can get that changed this year.

I digressed a little from the collective bargaining thing. But the notion is with reference to collective bargaining, that we need it; otherwise we're in a very weak position. We're in a weak position as a university and competing with other groups for funds. And also, the faculty are in a weak position. My own preference, which I've stated many times, is that we need enabling legislation that's reasonable and workable, so that we could engage in collective bargaining on short notice if we desired. That is, the faculty could organize and engage in it. I think that kind of threat makes the administration more responsible in dealing with us. And I also think that as a group, they don't want collective bargaining although some members of the Board of Regents, administration, actually apparently anticipate and look forward to it for different reasons. As a whole, I don't think they want to do it. And if we have the enabling legislation there, they would probably be much more attentive to faculty views on matters, in an attempt to avoid going into collective bargaining. But I hope we get some legislation this time.

Now, with reference to the personnel cases. I was really a bit surprised at what has happened this year in that area. I, as well as anyone, because of my own previous legal problems with the administration, understand that the administration at varying levels can in fact act in arbitrary ways and appear not too receptive to faculty rights and due process. But I somehow had the view that this was a fairly rare situation, and that these kinds of things didn't occur too often. Well, it turns out that I was right in one sense. They don't occur too often at the level of the Board of Regents, particularly any more, because they found out they could get sued and that they may be individually liable. What's happening, however, is that at lower

levels of the administration, very questionable and arbitrary decisions are being made in just about every college of the University. And I have gotten involved this year along with the NSP chapter in a number of these. Some unbelievably tragic cases, where the administration appears to have no feeling at all for faculty rights, for moral responsibilities, for due process. And also the administration appears to take a kind of knee-jerk reaction to always support its administrators. Any time they make a decision, they can do no wrong. And we have instances going on right now where faculty members have been seriously hurt by the actions of administrators and department chairmen. And the University appears quite willing to not only support them informally, but to go as far as to furnish them attorneys in hearings that are being held; a real commitment of resources in support of very dubious decisions when the administration doesn't really know what's going on in the cases.

I can't name names because of obvious reasons and also NSP policy. But there are cases where chairmen are acting in very arbitrary fashion, where they're actually doing what I consider illegal things, if not immoral things. And they're appearing to get away with it. And we're involved in a number of these cases throughout the system.

We have gained support from NSEA for two cases and I expect these to be filed within a couple of weeks. They involve a class-action suit that'll focus in the area of sex discrimination. There's an attempt being made to make that case system-wide and the attorney involved is looking at some materials from faculty members at UNIJV and the community college. And even DRI, interestingly enough, has managed this year to fire one of their few female staff members. So that one's coming along.

We have a number of other cases that just really boggle the mind, as far as I'm concerned, about the faculty members. I counted up and last week I spent twelve hours of my time talking with people about personnel problems and/or talking with their attorneys about personnel problems. And I started off today by spending an hour and a half with another person who is involved in a personnel difficulty. And they just come from all over. There's an apparent belief—and it's astonishing— that university administrators can do no wrong, and that there's an inviolate kind of rule about departmental autonomy. That is, the department makes the decision, however divisive or arbitrary—that it's right. And for the life of me, I can't believe that people really think judges, sitting on the bench, will accept that kind of capriciousness, you know. We do have in our system code and our by-laws, provisions that you have to meet to get promoted, to get salary increases, get tenure. And when people meet these and are turned down for reasons that are not stated in that code and other people don't meet them but are promoted, given tenure, given salary increases, and that can be demonstrated, you begin to wonder who's in charge. And here is a situation where I actually favor the intervention of some rationality from the outside, and have tried to do my part to get a hearing for some of these cases and will continue to work in this area.

It turns out, in fact, that this is a very crucial area and that a number of faculty are watching to see what NSP can do. There's the thought, particularly within some schools and colleges, that there's absolutely nothing you can do about your administrator. That there's no reason complaining to anyone, that you just have to accept the decisions, and in some schools and colleges we have easily documentable records of a number of faculty members coming, staying a while, and leaving

because they were dealt with in a fashion that is on face value unfair. And in some schools and colleges, in fact, you have a self-selection process going on, you begin to wonder about the quality of the people that remain. They tend to be very docile in nature.

There are a lot of people watching to see if there's anything that can break this tradition of total arbitrariness on the part of some department chairmen and administrators. And if NSP is successful in doing it, that's something that will really contribute to its being a force on campus. So far we've talked about general policies, like financial affairs at the University, collective bargaining, budgeting, that sort of thing. We've now spent a very busy year dealing with personnel things. And we're about to see some fruit borne as some suits are filed. And if we can win a few of those for the faculty, then it's going to be a whole different university, totally different.

Does affirmative action enter into this in any way?

It enters into it only to the extent that it is a joke. This University is not serious about affirmative action. There are some people who are serious about it, but they're not in positions to do anything about it. And it is generally treated as a joke. I attend department chairmen's meetings in the College of Arts and Science for instance, and when affirmative action is mentioned there, it's generally, you know, done so with some hilarity. "Here we are again—talking about affirmative action and here's what you've got to do or somebody's going to be on your neck and ha! ha!"

Well, you didn't mention whether any of these cases had to do with women or minorities.

Well, several of them do, in fact. At least three that I'm thinking of had to do with how minorities and women had been dealt with. And it's also a case at UNLV. NSP helped settle the case at UNLV, by the way, just this past week. A woman has been terminated without adequate notice and without substantial reasons, a nursing faculty member named Pat Tilley. (And I can mention her name because she is willing for that to happen, that is in the papers.) But she had been terminated, she was an NSP member, and NSP came to her rescue; they furnished her some money for an attorney who went with her to a meeting of the Academic Council at UNLV and they voted to support her, and forced her reinstatement. And that's the kind of thing that, unless somebody's willing to come up with the money, you can't do. You've got to have some support to be able to walk into an Academic Council meeting with an attorney and turn around an opinion. And that was done successfully down there. And they're involved in some other cases that NSEA is supporting on a state level as well. And interestingly enough, NSEA is spending much more money on personnel services of this nature with us in higher education than they're getting in dues money from us. They're really investing a lot in an attempt to keep the teaching profession unified. And they see this as very important. If they can't stand for faculty rights, then they don't deserve the support of faculty. I guess that's enough about that.

I might say a comment or two about what I see NSP doing in the future. I will be gone because of a sabbatical next year, and in a way, I hate to miss it, because I would have been faculty senate chairman and would obviously been involved in the legislative effort. But on the other hand, I couldn't give up a sabbatical. I'll be watching with interest as NSP enters the next year. We have a very capable fellow as president coming in, Glen Atkinson in

economics, who's well-known throughout the state and certainly has the favor of the governor, who has seen fit to appoint him head of a group to study the Nevada State Tax Commission. He's also very well-known in the Democratic party.

Glen and other NSP members will be involved in continuing efforts in the personnel cases. And as we get more recognition, we get more cases. They just come out of the woodwork. People all of a sudden realize there is something they can do. And I just think Glen will be very busy with that.

He'll also be busy with a lobbying effort in the state legislature concerning collective bargaining and possibly some other things. It's not clear whether NSP will choose to exempt itself from testifying on other bills that pertain to higher education. Last session we did; we wanted the bill on collective bargaining and that may be what we do again. But I'm almost certain we'll at least testify concerning University funding bills, because we've asked NSEA to do it as well. And we'll also be working with collective bargaining, and if we're successful in getting reasonable legislation, then in the following year, I'm sure some divisions will engage in collective bargaining very rapidly. I think particularly community colleges will start collective bargaining as soon as it's possible. And it may take a year or two after they've organized and been successful in winning more due process, of which they have little or none, more salary, of which they have very low levels, and what not. When the University faculty sees what they (CCD) can do with it then maybe they'll get more interested. I don't anticipate a rapid move to collective bargaining at UNR, UNLV, frankly.

You asked about some comments on the new president for UNR. We did take an interest in this. Many people are not

aware of the fact—and I don't mind saying it publicly—that a great deal of care was exercised in putting the presidential selection committee together, at least in terms of selection of the faculty members that went on the committee. And there were caucuses held throughout the University by interested groups of people and by the senate. And a committee was put together—deliberately put together—that would be, we felt, very strong and independent-minded. We did that knowing that that meant we couldn't influence them either. But we were willing to put people on there that had integrity and allowed them to do their thing and fight off attempts to influence them from other directions.

I had some problems with the committee, particularly in terms of a few procedural elements involving how closely they were working with the system administration, and expressed those and of course, got rebuffed. But in the main I'm pleased with the committee and I know a number of other people are, because they were a strong committee. Very independent minded and rebuffed all efforts, all explicit efforts to influence their choices and their criteria. And in the main they served well.

I don't want to sound like I personally am taking credit for structuring the committee, because I'm not. The senate chose those people that were on it. And it was the first senate meeting I've ever seen where we actually called a recess for caucusing. And we actually did that while this vote was going on. And we had run-off votes and that kind of thing. And we'd have a break for caucuses and people would decide who they wanted on and who we'd vote for, who various contingents would vote for, and all the people should consider themselves honored for having been selected. There was no accidental placements of people on the committee at all. And they

did what the senate wanted, and that is come up with some strong candidates.

I personally met every candidate that came in and was pleased with the overall caliber of them. And also pleased, for several reasons, that they fairly early on decided to eliminate local candidates, simply because I think we need an infusion of new blood in a very desperate situation, particularly in terms of our financial situation at UNR. And it was not obvious to me that any administrator presently at UNR was going to be able to turn the thing around—in a way, maybe because they had been here so long, I don't know. But it was just a feeling I had and it turned out that it was shared by many people, including the committee. So I'll be looking forward to the announcement of the new president in and hope that it can contribute to a change of climate, morale, or whatever, at UNR. In a way, I look at it our last chance [laughs]. In the last year, I've heard several faculty members say that if we don't get a new president who can do something, that they will leave. And that doesn't disturb you so much unless you pay attention to who it is that's saying it, because the job market is such that we can always replace them. But when faculty members judged by their peers to be very good, capable people, scholars in their area, say that kind of thing, you begin to wonder. And you begin to get concerned. And that's the comment I've heard from some of those kinds of people, that they're just tired of fighting this damn losing battle over finances, and what not.

I might comment a little on the finances, since I've mentioned it. The senate set up a new committee this year called the Institutional Studies and Budget Committee. And it has become, and very quickly, one of its most active committees. It has a budget subcommittee that began work

very quickly in the fall to affect the budget recommendations that will go into the next session of the legislature, for funding for the '75-'77 biennium. That budget subcommittee contained at least one member from every college on campus—college and school—deliberately for representativeness. And also it was enlarged to include five administrators recommended by the president. We've talked with him about getting certain administrators on there that we thought had a knowledge of the problems, and what not.

It's a group of about twenty people that has met over a dozen times this year in an official way and has worked many, many hours outside of those meetings. Some of those meetings have been with the chancellor and with his man on the budget, Don Jessup, and with Jim Anderson as we've talked about problems. We've had at least, I guess, three meetings with the chancellor and Don Jessup. And also Don Jessup was kind enough to come to several meetings in the fall, as we were trying to educate ourselves about how the budget is built in the system.

We came up with a number of recommendations and we were very pleased to see that the system administration incorporated a number of our suggestions in a new budgeting procedure that they're going to present to the 1975 state legislature. Also, they've been gracious enough to allow us to continue to have feed-back. And once they made their decisions—some of which were influenced by our early work—we've had a chance to respond again. And we've spent a great deal of time with a document which, for the record, you might want a copy of, that responds to what are called the "target budget" concepts. And that's really an outline of the procedures you're going to use in building your budget and setting up your requests. And I think we're going to be successful in

affecting some more change in a positive direction in the target budget concepts that they've developed.

Interestingly enough, we got a head start on this process but now each division is having the same opportunity to respond to those target budget concepts. And there's certainly a possibility for divisiveness here. In other words, if we want one thing and UNLV doesn't and the community college doesn't, chances are it won't get done. But if two or three of the divisions are together on a recommended change, the administration will be hard pressed to explain why it doesn't go along. So I feel very pleased about that effort. I and [Eugene K.] Gene Grotegut served as co-chairmen of that budget group, Allen Wilcox was chairman of the entire committee and

[Alfred W.] Al Stoess from business was vice chairman of the entire committee. We had a very hard working group. I think it's done some good.

There's a problem, of course, about getting the state government and state legislature to accept any change in funding formula. Many of them just fail to realize or don't care what's happened to UNR during the last three years of very severe financial problems. They drive by the campus and it's still there, and they say, well, the funding must have been okay. They don't ask the serious questions about what's really happening in terms of morale, and in terms of accomplishing what we're supposed to be doing, that kind of thing. And some people were disappointed when Governor O'Callaghan announced he was going to run for reelection, because it's believed by some of us that it'll be more difficult to get him to change his mind than it would have been to convince a new governor about a need for change in procedures. We don't know how successful we're going to be, but we're happy

and pleased to have been a part of the work so far.

Now, I might comment a little on Harold Jacobsen's many speeches on tenure. I have recently written a letter—a rather lengthy letter—to the *University Times*, which is the journalism department's paper, responding to an interview they did with him and published two weeks ago. And they are going to publish that letter and you might want to get a copy of his interview and my response. Also for the record, it summarizes some things that I and others feel about the problem. I would have to say that I and others feel that many of his comments about tenure are politically motivated. He has announced for the state senate and he's apparently running as a candidate who knows a lot about the University and therefore would be very valuable to have in the senate when questions come up about higher education.

I, of course, have had many disagreements with Harold Jacobsen, and certainly do not consider him an expert on higher education. If anything, he's badly misinformed, and very opinionated on some matters that have caused us to be harmed. He, for one, a northern regent should be very aware of the severe financial problems we're suffering. And yet, when we present our arguments to the Board of Regents on the work program as we did last year, he votes with the system administration and fails to vote in a way that would get more money for UNR. Interestingly enough, we got most of our support from UNLV regents. I thought that was also astonishing. There's supposed to be such sectionalism in the state and we got the support from—we did get support from Mel Steninger, too, we got support from two other regents from Vegas.

Well, anyway, back to Jacobsen and tenure. I just read an editorial in the NSEA state paper written by our capital correspondent

Guy Shipler, who's fairly well known in this state. And Shipler made a point that some others have already picked up on, and that is, Jacobsen may be really hurting himself in doing this thing about using the University as a political issue. Shipler's opinion is that the state classified employees, which is one of the largest blocs of people in Carson City, are going to recognize that what he's really talking about is job security for public employees. He's either doing that—talking about the broader issue of job security—or he is just using the University as a political issue. And if they decide as a group that he's really talking about job security, they're going to vote against him and vote for Archie Pozzi, who's been very good to them in the state legislature, in the primary, and he (Jacobsen) is going to lose. On the other hand, if they decide he's just using the University issue as a political thing, they may get mad at him for that too, you know, because it's an old strategy tactic in this state, but it bothers some people that it's used so much. So it's going to be very interesting to see what happens. I predict that he will lose the primary to Archie Pozzi over the issue of job security, and the fact that Pozzi has such a close relationship with the classified employees. Frankly, I hope he does lose because I don't think he will be of any use to the University in the state legislature.

With reference to his statements on tenure, I don't think he understands tenure very much, or very well. He makes statements that seem to indicate he's not even aware of the system code itself, and the provisions in that code and in the document that was written after the Adamian case covering disruptions on campus and what not—*Rules and Disciplinary Procedures*. There are ways in the code and in the *Rules and Disciplinary Procedures* for getting rid of tenured faculty. There are a number of grounds, some of

which are so nebulous they could be used to do nearly anything, and there's certainly the ground of incompetence. And Jacobsen seems hesitant to use his own code to try and get rid of some of this "deadwood" he talks so much about in general terms. He'd rather talk about deadwood in general terms, when there are ways to get rid of deadwood if you are willing to make the charges and try to prove them. He just demonstrates a lack of understanding about this problem. And that makes him even more suspect, that he's using it for political means.

Is he being swayed by this new concept of accountability in education?

Well, he went to some meetings past year and heard some talks and was very impressed by them. And one of them was about accountability and they also used the word "output." And he comes back talking about them. And it's just astonishing to some of us to listen to the guy talk. He assumes, for instance that we're not paying attention to that which we produce. He says we've got to have a new approach to things and focus on output. He assumes that we haven't been concerned about "output," and that we've only been concerned about things like getting continuing increase in our salaries. And that's the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard.

I spend hour after hour of my time in faculty senate committee meetings, in the senate itself, along with dozens and dozens of other faculty members who are trying to decide how to help students get a good education. And we don't use his magic word, but for him to say anything that implies we're not concerned about what we put out in terms of students is patently ridiculous. And it disturbs me that he would—he, the chief spokesman for the Board of Regents would—

say things like that in public. Knowing how hard a time we have in getting any positive sentiments anyway in this state, for him to go around and talking about things like that, and about deadwood on the faculty, and what not, it's—it's just really appalling. And I happen to know a lot of people share that opinion, including some very, very high political leaders in the state who see that electing Board of Regents members does not totally serve the interest of higher education, and certainly not the state. Because people get elected who don't know anything about it, and who are actually, basically "anti-intellectual."

We're not the only state that suffers from the problem. There are some states that have avoided the problem by setting, you know, different methods. And, by the way, we—that is NSP and NSEA—are going to try and use the mechanism present to try to get some good people on the Board of Regents. Seven of the nine seats are up for reelection. And we have been spending some of our time—I say we, I and a few others—talking to potential candidates on the Board of Regents. We've set up a political action group between UNR and Western Nevada Community College that's going to work with NSEA and the Washoe County Teachers Association for gathering funds, endorsing candidates, working for them. And we're going to see if we can change the structure of the Board of Regents.

And by changing it we are not interested—I've been asked this question, I'll answer it the same way every time—I'm not interested in getting someone on there that I can call and tell 'em how to vote. What I'm interested in is getting someone in there who favors higher education, knows what good higher education is, and someone who will allow me to go back to my sociology research and writing and teaching and do that and not have to worry about how the University is run. Given a

choice I'll take a guy that has principles and proper values any time than a sycophant that I can influence, because I've really got better things to do with my time, to be honest with you.

I don't know how we're going to fare in these races. It's almost too bad that the election is this year, because NSP is so "young." We're just getting organized, really; we're two or three years old and we're just getting our feet on the ground. And it's a tough challenge. I'm not sure what'll happen, but we're trying to get some good candidates in the races and to work for them and get 'em elected to the board. And then we hope to be able to leave 'em alone and let them run the University in proper fashion. And that's our goal.

Very quickly I might name some people that are running. Steninger has resigned and many of us view that very positively because he's also an anti-intellectual. Molly Knudtsen has indicated she wants to run for that seat; many of us view that very positively; she's a very good person. Dr. Lombardi, you know, he's 67, apparently is going to try and run again, but we—even though he has voted with us on a thing or two, particularly dues withholding, which we were successful in getting again this past year, after carrying it to the Board of Regents three separate times, we're trying to get other candidates; some think he is a little old for the job and too disposed to the Medical School, and we prefer to see another person there. In Carson City, Jacobsen is not running, Dan Walsh has entered the race, and a man named George T. Earnhart has entered the race. So far, people at the University tend to favor Earnhart, although a number are also talking with other potential candidates down there. Dan Walsh used to be counsel for the Board of Regents and a number of people were not

too impressed by the type of decisions he was making as special counsel to the board.

In Las Vegas, as far as I know, no present occupant has said publicly they're going to run. Helen Thompson is apparently toying with the idea of running for county commissioner. We've got a potentially very good candidate in her district that may run against her, John Harrington, just immediate past president of the state NSEA, and a very sharp man. Bill Morris and Nedra Joyce would have to run against one another because Nedra's an appointee to the board. Bill probably won't run unless he can get his legal problems squared away. And Nedra's in a position where she has trouble serving on the board and holding down a job, and I'm not sure she will run. Most people think Regent Kohn will run again. In fact, he's probably a choice for chairman of the Board of Regents, a logical kind of choice, because he's one of the few that will repeat on the Board of Regents, maybe.

As far as other candidates, I'm not sure how things are going in Las Vegas. I haven't talked to people down there in a few days, so I don't really know. But we're going to try to affect those races and get a good Board of Regents. Get some people off that've been on; some of them aren't involved here at all.

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE

DON DRIGGS, CHAIRMAN

Don Driggs: My name is Don Driggs. And I've been chairman of the Presidential Search Committee for the academic year of '73-'74. The committee came into existence as a result of the resignation of President N. Edd Miller, in August of 1973.

There were kind of mixed reactions, I think, as I viewed it, to the resignation of President Miller. On the one hand, he was so well liked personally, I think that many faculty members felt that they would be losing a personal friend. On the other hand, there were at least a substantial number of faculty who felt that President Miller had had some rough times, that perhaps his effectiveness as a president was not as great as it once had been, and that perhaps for him personally, it was a good time for him to move.

I remember talking with him at the time of the attempted ouster by a couple of members of the Board of Regents. And he stated at that time that he just, you know, had nowhere to go. In other words, had he submitted his resignation, about the only option he had was to go back into the department of speech

where he had a tenured position. There were no other pending positions and it was, you know, a very low point at that time in his career. I think he had recovered from that low point, to show support of faculty and students and so on. But I think in the back of his mind was the feeling that, you know, maybe he better take advantage of an opportunity when it came along, rather than face that type of prospect again 'cause he had two members on the board, especially the regents [Mel] Steninger and [William] Morris, who were still very negative toward Miller. And he realized this, and he realized they could make trouble.

Well, in terms of the setting up of the Search Committee, the first thing that I recall as far as getting involved at all myself was that not long after the president's resignation (I believe it was the first part of September), one of the members of my department, Jim Shields, who also was a member of the Faculty Senate, came into my office and asked if I would be willing to be a candidate for the membership on the Presidential Search

Committee. He mentioned that the Faculty Senate apparently was being asked to come up with the committee, that Chancellor Humphrey had talked to JoDeen Flack about recommending to him a membership of a committee. I think it's probably more than recommending; in fact, the Faculty Senate would name this committee which would then conduct the initial search.

Ruth G. Hilts: Is this covered by the code? Does it specify how a committee shall be chosen?

No, no this is one of the holes in the code, I think. I haven't seen the by-laws for this particular campus which have been worked on. Actually, I guess these were held up until the University system code was approved. But the code mainly specifies that a committee shall be formed; it doesn't state how it will be done. And it was, I guess, Chancellor Humphrey's prerogative, in a way to, you know, name the Faculty Senate as the body which would name this committee.

When Jim Shields talked to me about being a candidate, he said that a number of members of the Senate had gotten together and had decided that they should support a slate of candidates from Arts and Science. I guess these are probably the representatives from Arts and Science who were in the Senate. At the same time, they felt the need to have some type of information, advice, from the faculty as a whole, in the College of Arts and Science. And so what they planned to do was to ask the Arts and Science faculty members to nominate individuals for this committee. And then when it came to the Senate itself, they would back the three top people. But at any rate, some members, some of the Arts and Science senators, wanted to kind of push for a slate of candidates; otherwise, if you just ask for nominations without anybody usually

organizing behind anybody, you get such a scattering. And with a college as large as Arts and Science, this usually happens in various types of elections where Arts and Science faculty are involved. There's usually somebody organized— sometimes it's just a large department agrees to back a certain person from their department, and this gives them a chance at least to get into the final election. In this case, there was just the one because of the time factor. There was just the one kind of nomination ballot, or recommendations from faculty members to the Arts and Science senators.

So the slate, as I understand it, was made up of Gene Grotegut, who had been a former president of the AAUP chapter and also was active in National Society of Professors on campus. And Bob Tompson—I didn't realize at the time, but Bob Tompson was also a member of the National Society of Professors. He hadn't been a very active member, but he was a dues-paying member. And this is perhaps the reason why Shields and Richardson and some of the others were backing Tompson, in addition to the fact that he had very good standing with many of the faculty members who looked up to the way in which he had handled committee assignments and so on before. So I was the third member of this slate.

Well, when it came to this kind of nomination, ballot, or recommendation, by the Arts and Science faculty as a whole, as I was shown the list afterwards, Gene Grotegut came out with the most votes, with Bob Tompson second, and I was third. And then Jim Hulse was fourth. I think here, if it hadn't been for this kind of slate, which was talked around, at least among many of the departments, that Jim Hulse probably would have been on the committee, because in the past whenever there had been this type of

thing, and being fairly open, Hulse was almost invariably elected to search committees. I served on the Arts and Science dean's search committee with Hulse. He's been on the vice presidential search committee and on previous Arts and Science dean's search committees so he's—just about any election he would come out tops. But in effect, Hulse was squeezed out by this slate that was organized.

So the meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on September 20, 1973, to select the members. Now, I'm not sure just how some of the other members were selected, other than the faculty representatives.

Did other colleges submit candidates as Arts and Science did?

Yes, apparently this was done in most of the other colleges. But I think in the other colleges, they came up with just one candidate realizing that Arts and Science having over half of the faculty members, that there wouldn't be the likelihood of more than one candidate from one of the professional schools being selected. As it turned out, of course, Arts and Science only had two of the six faculty representatives, or two out of eleven of the total membership, even though it had well over half of the faculty. But, of course, there was another factor, too, and that was that you had Dean O'Brien selected. He was selected by the Academic Council to represent the academic deans. And since he is out of an Arts and Science discipline, this in effect it was another Arts and Science individual.

But apparently there was quite a meeting. I wasn't present at the September 20th meeting where the big problem centered around who would be the six faculty representatives. Incidentally, it was agreed by the Faculty Senate that there would be, in addition to the six faculty representatives, one member from

the Academic Council, one representative of the alumni (which was, I think, a first as far as presidential search committees), one representative from the staff, from the classified (actually she was chosen by the Classified Employees Council, I guess, in terms of that representation), and then two students. Originally, the decision of the executive board of the Faculty Senate was to recommend that only one student be a member. Terry Reynolds put up a considerable fight on this issue, tried to get support for three student members. And there was an eventual compromise of giving the students two seats on the committee. Apparently the Alumni Association held a meeting and Judy Nash won the endorsement of the Alumni Council. As I understand it, it was down to the last ballot, between Judy Nash and Corky Lingenfelter who was a former assemblyman and who wanted to be on the committee quite badly. But Judy Nash, whose father is a professor of English and who is a teacher at Hug High School, was chosen by the Alumni. And this then was endorsed by the Faculty Senate, as well as the election of Pat Fladager to represent the staff and the classified employees, and Dean O'Brien to represent the Academic Council. The Associated Students, I'm not sure how the selections were made, but Terry Reynolds, the student body president, and Don Cecich, who had been formerly president of Nye Hall the year before, and had been very active in student affairs, were the ones who were openly endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

In the election for the faculty representatives, there apparently was a first vote. I don't know how it came out, in terms of the votes for the people from the various areas, but in terms of the three Arts and Science people, in the first vote, Gene Grotegut had more votes than either Tompson or myself

for membership. But the Arts and Science senators held a little caucus after the first vote, and decided that it was going to be hard, of course, to get all three on. I think originally they were pushing for, you know, Grotegut, first, because he had received the most votes. But there was also the feeling that Grotegut might be difficult to get a majority vote as the ballots—as certain people dropped, as they narrowed it down to the final group, the final election. And they apparently decided after this caucus to push for me, that I was probably more acceptable to the professional senators and so on than Grotegut. Grotegut had been very active in politics. He was the chairman of the Democratic Central Committee for Washoe County, was considered a very strong liberal. This antagonized, apparently, from time to time, some members of the professional schools who were sitting as faculty representatives on the senate. At any rate, as it turned out, I was the first Arts and Science representative who was elected. And then it was down, I guess, to a very strong fight, not the individuals themselves were there, but it was supporters of Grotegut and Tompson. And they tied, they had a run-off ballot, eventually Tompson won out on this. So, Grotegut ended up as an alternate, along with Joe Robertson who's professor emeritus of agriculture. So it ended up with two people from the Arts and Science faculty, Bob Tompson and myself.

I think there was a desire to have a couple of women faculty members. Mary Ellen Glass from the Oral History Project and Sally Kees from Home Economics were chosen. Sally Kees was pushed hard by Jim Richardson, who was the vice chairman of the senate and who also was a member of the National Society of Professors. And then Ralph Young was chosen from Agriculture and Bob McKee from Engineering. I think it's interesting here

that with Young and McKee, these were the individuals from their respective colleges who perhaps had the best standing with Arts and Science faculty members. In other words, they were viewed as individuals who had broader outlooks than just their own professional college, and therefore, they were electable.

Education had nominated Tom Tucker. And Tucker had had a lot of experience in terms of selection of school superintendents and even the president of the community college division in Nevada. I guess the Education people thought well, here's our best qualified person, he's in school administration, and so on. But perhaps you can take into account the fact that Tucker would be totally unacceptable to Arts and Science faculty as well as others, on the basis of his kind of general reputation. So as a result of this, Education lost out and didn't have a representative.

And there was much criticism, I think, throughout this whole process during the year, from certain deans, especially from, I think, the deans of Education and Business, which are two of the larger professional schools in the standpoint of the number of faculty, that they didn't have representatives. Of course, this has been suggested as something for future consideration is that perhaps each college should have a representative. But this would make a very large committee, much larger than the one we had. And then you get into that question, too, of kind of, you know, one-man—one-vote type of representation. If you do this, then Arts and Science should have more, because it has over half the faculty. So it's a touchy situation, I think. I personally feel that we reached about as large a committee as could really function effectively, with eleven; if you get much larger than that, you're going to have some problems.

So we were informed (those who were selected by the Faculty Senate) by JoDeen

Flack of our selection. And she called a meeting for the next week. It was on Friday; I believe it was September 28, for the first organizational meeting. It was primarily for the purpose of selecting a chairman.

Now, the thing here that—by the time we were officially notified and they called a meeting, there wasn't much time left, between, maybe only a couple of days. I tried to get hold of Bob Tompson on a number of occasions. I didn't realize at the time, I didn't find out until later, that they'd kind of turned his office into kind of a computer terminal there at Scrugham Engineering, and so when he didn't have classes, he was usually working in his home. And so I kept trying to get him at his number in the office and couldn't get him. I was going to try to talk Bob into being chairman of the committee. And then my fall-back position here was Ralph Young, if Bob wouldn't agree to that. I thought that either one of them would make an excellent chairman. But as it turned out, the press of other things, not being able to get ahold of Bob, nothing was done on this ahead of time.

He was usually working in his home. And so I kept trying to get him at his number in the office and couldn't get him. I was going to try to talk Bob into being chairman of the committee. And then my fall-back position here was Ralph Young, if Bob wouldn't agree to that. I thought that either one of them would make an excellent chairman. But as it turned out, the press of other things, not being able to get ahold of Bob, nothing was done on this ahead of time.

And so we got into the meeting and right away, I started to question Ralph Young; that is, as soon as the meeting was kind of open, on the chairmanship type of thing. And Ralph said no, you know, under no circumstances

would he take the chairmanship. He had been the chairman of the vice presidential search committee at the time Anderson had been selected. And I think in addition to the fact he had gone through this process over a several months period, he also felt a real letdown in terms of what eventually happened, because after doing a search nationwide for the vice president, and bringing in several candidates, having been assured by President Miller at the start that Acting Vice President Anderson would not be a candidate for the permanent position, right near the end of the process, President Miller indicated that he would like to have Anderson's name added to the list. And apparently this was done reluctantly by the members of the committee. As Ralph Young expressed to the [Presidential Search] committee later, that this was—he said, "I guess we weren't a very strong committee. In other words, we didn't resist this kind of indirect pressure from the president. He made it known to individual members, a couple of individual members of the committee, who in turn passed it on to me—didn't ask the committee, you know, formally, to add Anderson's name to the list." And so this is what occurred.

Now, at any rate, Young felt, too, that in that case, President Miller did not, even though they sent him three names—I guess it was five names, they say on a slate of five—that he didn't even investigate at all, the other four people; just named Anderson right away. And that committee felt that one candidate was *clearly* superior to the other four, and yet he didn't receive any consideration. But anyway, he had kind of a bad taste in his mouth out of that experience of where he'd been chairman. And plus having practically a whole year shot in terms of all the work that went into it. And so he said he'd served his time and that he wouldn't accept the chairmanship.

Well, then somebody nominated me for chairman. And I was just trying to think of who it was—I can't remember. It may have been, well, it may have been Bob Tompson. I think, I guess, it was Bob Tompson. I remember Dean O'Brien seconded the nomination.

And then I tried to beg off in a way, because of the fact that the year previously, I had been chairman of the Arts and Science search committee for a dean. And I felt that I had, you know, served as chairman there. But Tompson stated well, that wasn't really a time-consuming thing. And actually, the way it had worked out, we had asked for nominations from the faculty, and when we found such strong sentiment for Gorrell—in fact, every other member of the Arts and Science faculty locally who'd been nominated had withdrawn in favor of Gorrell. So we ended up not making an extensive search. There were some people nominated from outside, but as we compared their credentials with Gorrell's, we felt that his stood out above them. And so we ended up, you know, with not a very time-consuming job and had talked to President Miller, got him to accept just the one nomination. And so it hadn't been—you know, we hadn't gone through the extensive type of search and interview process that is usually involved. At any rate, Tompson made the point that I really didn't have, you know, much of a taste of this type of hard work that a chairman usually goes through.

Well, I then countered and said I would agree to remain as a nominee for the chairmanship, if Bob Tompson would agree to accept the nomination. So we could have a vote of the committee on it. And he agreed under those circumstances. And then we had a secret ballot of the committee members and I was selected. So my plans at trying to avoid this was quite—just didn't work out too well.

So we did discuss some other things generally at that first meeting. There was some discussion of the relationship with the chancellor, the committee's relationship, and the need to have a meeting with the chancellor and to find out directly from him some of the charge and the procedures which he felt that the committee should follow. But JoDeen Flack at that meeting, mentioned that she was just there to get the committee organized, see that it got organized, and once the committee had its chairman, why, she wouldn't be involved. Now, later on we had some attempts [laughs] at influence in terms of JoDeen, but at that time, [she] said the committee was strictly on its own in terms of procedures and criteria, and whatever you wanted to set up.

This, incidentally, was something that did come back a little later. JoDeen and Jim Richardson, who was vice chairman of the Faculty Senate, felt that in, you know, in some ways that the committee was a creature of the Faculty Senate, and perhaps was in some ways responsible to the Faculty Senate. Whereas the code just stipulated that the committee would be formed and would make recommendations to the chancellor and the Board of Regents. And this the committee felt quite strongly about. In other words, that our responsibility was to the University community as a whole, and specifically to make these recommendations to the chancellor and to the Board.

In terms of the committee members, we had our first meeting the next week, the first week in October that is, the first meeting after this initial organizational meeting. Of the members of the committee, I knew all the committee members fairly well except for—well, I guess there were three—Judy Nash, who I knew but didn't know very well; she happened to be a student at the University during the four years I was gone,

from '61-'65. Don Cecich I didn't know, and Sally Kees I hadn't known previously. But the other seven members I had known quite well over a period of time. And maybe that's one of the reasons I was selected as chairman, is that many members of the committee knew me over quite a long period of time.

In terms of the way the committee worked together, I think you could tell right away, the first meeting or two, how things were going to go. And as a whole, the committee worked very well together. And there was a certain openness. There were a couple of times when we had some problems. The individual who oftentimes was opposed either to procedures which the rest had agreed upon—in fact, he kind of labeled himself “the pest” at times when he would send a memo to members of the committee protesting what had been agreed upon, or wanting a variation in the approach and so on— was Bob McKee from the College of Engineering, and he realized that he was kind of alone on some of the things. Bob later, toward the end of the search process, mentioned to me that the reason he oftentimes took exception to what had generally been agreed upon in the committee was that he felt that there were a few faculty members who seemed to be kind of running the show, or seemed to be making most of the decisions. And he thought this way he would open it up a little and perhaps give some of the others a chance to, you know, make suggestions or to get involved more than they had already.

But other than these things—and here once more, in the case of McKee, it wasn't something where there was, you know, any real bitterness that involved in this. But some members of the committee felt that oh, some of the committee deliberations were just prolonged more than they needed to be because of McKee not going along.

And he was deliberately trying to give the non-faculty members a chance to disagree?

He felt that there was, you know, too much a situation where the, you know, other people were just, you know, afraid to speak out, as far as some of the committee members who were the most outspoken. Now, here I would say that the individuals who—well, there were perhaps two who took a lead here and at times a third one, in terms of their positions, in addition to myself. But Tom O'Brien was one of those who usually had a way of doing things if he wanted to push, and spoke out very strongly. Mary Ellen Glass was another one who very much was involved in proposing approaches. And then Bob Thompson would be the third one. And there was a tendency especially for, you know, the students in the early going not to contribute much or just kind of go along. The same was true of Judy Nash. Now, later on when we got down to the selection process of individuals, Judy Nash became quite outspoken in certain cases. But in the early going, once more, her association with many of the people had been as a student here at the University, and she was perhaps reluctant at first to put forth her position. And Pat Fladager in the early going, too, didn't have too much to say. So, at any rate, Bob McKee felt he was, I guess, trying to counteract the situation where he felt that Tom O'Brien and Mary Ellen Glass and Bob Thompson and myself were kind of making the decisions, and everybody else was just kind of going along.

The committee, when it met, had certain things to decide. One of them had to do with just how we were going to advertise. This was perhaps the most critical decision at first, in order to get things going. We decided that we would, of course, have to follow the Affirmative Action procedures, not only have

to follow, but wanted to follow these. And there would have to be national advertising. We decided on the *Chronicle of Higher Education* as the vehicle for this national advertising because most college, university administrators appear to read the *Chronicle*. It was also decided to send letters, too, with a kind of a brief description of the vacancy and the type of person we wanted, to the presidents of selected colleges and universities across the country, asking for nominations.

So I made out an original list, which was then circulated to the members of the committee who, in turn, added other names or other colleges and universities to this. We made sure that we sent these letters to presidents of mainly black colleges and universities, as well as college and universities of which had enrollments which were made up mainly of women, in terms once more of the Affirmative Action procedures.

It was interesting here to me, in terms of the Affirmative Action, of how few what we would call bona fide candidates we received—that is, nominations for women and minority candidates. And actually, the ones who were well qualified among the women all refused to become candidates. Of course, in most cases, they were presidents or vice presidents of some fairly prestigious schools, and didn't want to move on. But we didn't receive any nominations of blacks from presidents of black universities and colleges. We did get responses, but in most cases, these presidents didn't have any nominations to make. But we did receive some nominations of blacks, but they were from other presidents, not presidents of the predominantly black institutions.

So in addition, we decided to send letters soliciting nominations to certain foundations, certain organizations of higher education, certainly the women's caucus groups and

so on that we could find. And this in this regard, Mary Ellen Glass and Sally Kees and Judy Nash, especially, were active in writing personally to women's caucus-type people throughout the country, trying to solicit nomination of women.

Then we also decided that we would send just about the same letter that we sent to presidents—in fact what we did was to have a memo to the faculty on the other side of a copy of the letter we were sending to the presidents throughout the country, so the faculty would see what type of solicitation letter we were giving, and at the same time asking the faculty to send its nominations. We didn't receive a lot of nominations from the faculty. And I have kind of an interesting point here, too, in terms of some of the later support that developed, especially among the deans, for Acting President Anderson, was that he was nominated by one faculty member who wasn't even a *teaching* faculty member; Harry Wolf nominated Jim Anderson, and he might have been overlooked [laughs] almost completely.

So we decided on this approach, as far as the solicitation of nominations, of course, stressing that any member of the committee could nominate any number of people they wanted. It was wide open in terms of the nomination procedure. So we made that type of decision very early.

And then we also had to try to decide on what type of criteria we were going to put into the ad in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* as well as the in the letter. In other words, if we just left it completely open, there was a feeling that we were just going to be so inundated with applications that we'd never get out from under it.

So there were two things that were agreed on early by the committee as far as criteria. One was an earned doctorate. There also was

this type of decision, that this was something that there could be compensations for. In other words, that it wouldn't have to be true. The way the letter was phrased, it was that the candidate should possess an earned doctorate. And the other provision was senior administrative experience, preferably in higher education. Now (the—) interesting point here once more, this preference, you know, could be overcome by other factors. In fact, in terms of the ultimate selection of Max Milam, he did not have the senior administrative experience in higher education, but as he had headed the department of administration for the state of Arkansas, had been the chief fiscal officer for the state, and it was felt this compensated in that way. In terms of the senior administrative experience, it was felt that this was dean or above, or a comparable position to a dean. In other words, that a department chairman would not be considered as senior administrative experience. And the feelings that were expressed by some members of the committee at that time was that unless the individual was really in one of the higher administrative positions, you really couldn't tell how he was going to operate; that individuals moving from mainly faculty-type positions, which many of us I think view the department chairman as kind of representing his faculty, to a higher administrative position, that oftentimes they change very much—individuals—in their approach. And so we felt this was an important factor.

In the letter that we sent Out, we also mentioned this and this was something we later asked about in terms of our reference letters, as well; we stated that in addition to having ability to work well with faculty, students, and staff, a candidate should be able to communicate effectively with the alumni, the community and state and local political

leaders. And I think this helped us later on, in terms of especially, as this was included in our letters we sent out for references for the candidates. By mentioning each of these areas and the constituencies whom the president would have to deal, we oftentimes got comments on most of these areas, instead of just kind of general comments. So we agreed on those two criteria.

Now, later on, we added a couple more; in other words, ones which weren't in the *Chronicle for Higher Education* ad and in the letters we sent out for nominations. But these were added and were used during the period when we were deciding which ones we were going to seriously consider. And one of these was that the individual should have some experience we didn't specify, but I think we were thinking of at least three or four years as a minimum of full-time teaching-faculty experience. Now, once more, this was something that could be, you know, compensated for by other factors. And one of our three finalists Dr. Gerth, did not have this full-time teaching experience. He had taught part-time while being an administrator, but he had gone right into administration out of graduate school. And the fourth criteria was some evidence of scholarly contributions. And these two did help us in screening out some people, if they didn't have other very strong areas to compensate for some lacks there.

So the criteria we discussed—actually, there were other factors that were considered in which there really wasn't enough agreement that we could use these as criteria as a whole, as far as the committee, but I'm sure each, you know, individual had some other additional things that he was looking for. Certainly, I think the alumni or students were looking for a little charisma, in terms of the leader, one who would be an excellent public speaker

and public relations-type person. Some of the faculty members, I think, were more concerned with a scholarly type person, although one who also could work well with the chancellor and the Board of Regents and the political individuals, such as the governor and the legislators. But also, there seemed to be a feeling that, you know, somebody who had innovative ideas; you know, some members of the committee seemed to stress this. But it was hard to really, you know, get a consensus on the makeup other than, you know, certain of these very basic criteria. And it was each individual, you know, using his own criteria.

One thing that is perhaps somewhat of a puzzlement to me is the fact that, you know, we set up these criteria, were very broad, and yet when it came down to the final candidates, that six of the final nine candidates, the ones who were invited to the campus, were political scientists. Which made it a little embarrassing for me, being a political scientist and chairman of the department, in terms of trying to figure out why this, you know, came about. One factor perhaps was that Terry Reynolds, the student body president, was a political science major and he may well have been prejudiced in favor of that type. Mary Ellen Glass had been a former political science major (she had a joint major of political science and history), and so perhaps was attracted to individuals in that field. But still, this was only say three of us who, you know, might have had that type of prejudice. I, you know, just felt, and I think other members of the committee expressed this feeling, too—in fact, Ralph Young expressed this before the Board of Regents when this question came up as to why the final three candidates were political scientists. And Ralph said he would have loved to have seen a person from other professional areas, you know, on that

final list. But that he found himself having to go with the top marks for the political science candidates because they had the strongest recommendations and made the best impression before the committee. But this is all out of proportion, you know, in terms of the final candidates. It may be that many of the people were looking; that is, the members of the committee were looking for individuals who could perform this political function well, in terms of relationship with the political entities in the state as well as with the chancellor and the Board. And the political scientists might have had, you know, this type of background, in addition to having the good references. But as I recall, out of our top twenty-nine candidates I think it was, that we ultimately did a re-voting on to get final ranking, that only seven of those were political scientists. That is, it was, you know, only seven Out of twenty-nine and yet, when it came right down to it, you know, at the end, the top six candidates were political scientists. So that's a difficult one for me to figure Out, just why it came out so one-sided and, you know, toward one discipline. And later on, especially the deans, who met the candidates themselves, and especially the deans of the professional colleges, were very critical, you know, of this factor. Plus the fact that there were no candidates of the last nine from outside of the Arts and Science disciplines.

Well, in terms of the committee meetings as a whole, I think they functioned very well. We did have some problems and perhaps I could mention these a little later. First, in terms of the finalizing of the procedures, we did have a meeting with Neil Humphrey. And the meeting went very well.

I think you had this situation which carried over throughout much of our deliberation, is that some members of the committee were fearful that Humphrey was going to influence

the committee in various ways. And so it became very evident to me, you know, very early, that he was not going to have, you know, really any influence. And for that matter, in talking with him, he expressed to me the fact that he was not going to interfere. And I, having known Neil for many years, going back to at least to 1960 when he first came to the University, I just felt that he was being straight with us, that he was not going to try to have any influence. But, as I say, with a certain number of the committee, it was almost like paranoia. So you had situations when Humphrey would make certain suggestions, if I made known to the committee that Humphrey had made a suggestion, it was just, you know, like turning them off *completely*.

For instance, oh, after about a month or so of meetings, we had a situation where UNLV was in its final stages of selecting its president. And one of their final candidates came to Reno to meet with Chancellor Humphrey. He was interviewing the five—well, I guess, I guess they had five finalists. And so Neil called me up and asked if I would like to have lunch and meet this individual. And also, that it would be all right if I wanted to set up a meeting on campus for the other members of the committee to meet him. He [Humphrey] thought [the candidate] had impressive credentials and so on, and we might want to consider him as a candidate.

When I mentioned this to the committee, I got not One taker who was willing to meet with this man. And the interesting thing here, too, is that at the meeting of the Board of Regents later on, when we were discussing the procedures we'd followed and so on, the chairman of the Board, Jacobsen, asked me why we hadn't given more consideration to Fred Binder, who was the individual in question. He was president of Whittier College in California. Jacobsen said the

committee had been very impressed with him. And the point I made to Jacobsen at that time was that he had been nominated for our presidency, had written him asking him if he were willing to be considered a candidate, and that we'd never heard anything from him. And I think that, of course, turned off the committee, too. You know, the fact that he hadn't even responded to that. When I talked with Binder, he told me the reason he hadn't was that he was already a candidate at UNLV and he didn't think it would be right to be a candidate at both. But I think the committee felt that he should have at least responded, you know.

But I was very impressed with Binder. And when I did throw his hat in, got copies—actually, I asked the Las Vegas chairman of their selection committee to send me copies of his material. And this, I told Binder I was doing, and he agreed. I showed him around the campus and he seemed to be impressed, and so on. And yet when it came to actually rating him, he came out fairly low. I think much lower than he would have otherwise. Except that some way he was connected, you know, with the fact the chancellor had tried to set up a meeting—.

You have a very independent committee.

It was very independent, plus the fact that also, you know, the UNLV thing, and the fact that he hadn't responded to the letter. But anyway, that the committee was very concerned about the chancellor not interfering.

Now, the chancellor mentioned at this meeting— this is something that came back later on in terms of the role of the chancellor—that he intended to go to the campuses of each of the finalists whose names were given to him at the end of the procedure to visit the

individuals on their campuses. Now, this, as it turned out, he didn't do in the case of the Las Vegas committee and, you know, eventually it kind of shed some doubt in my mind whether he would do that, you know, with our own.

In the Las Vegas situation, of course, one of the final candidates was Don Baepler, who was the acting president. And then there was this Fred Binder and apparently he tried to—they tried to set up some dates and couldn't, that would work out; so finally, Binder flew up to Reno and met Humphrey here but he didn't see him on his own campus. Another of the candidates who had been at Las Vegas for a meeting with the committee saw Humphrey in Reno on his way back. And then Humphrey had flown to University of Oklahoma to interview one candidate on his campus—but just the one candidate.

Well, actually, I guess that I've mentioned there were five finalists in Las Vegas, there were actually four names that went to the chancellor and the Board. And apparently the reason the chancellor didn't visit Whittier was because they just couldn't work out the times. In the case of the individual, Barry, who was also a candidate at our campus, who was from Evergreen State College in Washington, the reason (the chancellor) apparently didn't go to his campus is that he was so unimpressed in his interview that he had with him in Reno, that he kind of ruled him out, I think. And so he did go to Oklahoma, because otherwise, it was either a matter of the Oklahoman coming to Reno, or the chancellor going there. He wanted possibly to see him on his own campus.

He made some very nice comments about this man Nordby from Oklahoma. And I have an idea that he may have been the chancellor's recommendation to the board for Las Vegas. But Baepler had such strong support from the Las Vegas regents that I think, you know, he

would have been selected regardless of who the chancellor recommended.

But one of the things that Neil Humphrey had mentioned to me in our first conversation was that things had not worked out well in terms of his relationships with the committee in Las Vegas on the interview situation. He had asked the committee to notify him when the people would come to campus, so that he would go to Las Vegas and have an initial interview with the people there. And so he made it very plain to me that he hoped that we would run things differently.

But this was a problem that came back to plague us and this became one of the main—practically the only thing—that I think really caused some problems in the committee, was that the chancellor made a strong statement that he wanted to interview the candidates when they were here. Now, the Las Vegas committee, at least the chairman indicated to me, that they had kind of deliberately sabotaged Humphrey's efforts to interview the individuals when they came to Las Vegas campus, because they didn't want him in on the process at that point. They felt that, you know, if they made their recommendations to him, then he could worry about you know, interviewing 'em and so on. And members of that committee had spoken to JoDeen Flack and Jim Richardson who in turn had talked to members of our committee in making a strong point they felt the chancellor shouldn't become involved. They thought that in some way he was going to influence the committee.

Well, I made the pitch when I was actually approached on this by both JoDeen and Jim Richardson, there was no way Humphrey was going to influence the committee. If he tried to, it would be counterproductive; you know, work against what he was trying to get over in terms of the feel I had for the committee and

the way it responded. And so I felt strongly that the committee should (or the chairman should) notify the chancellor when the committee members were going to be here and work it out so that it would fit in with his schedule so that he could interview them. And one of my strong points here, too, or one of the things I felt strongly about was that the candidates themselves should have this type of interview with the chancellor to help them decide whether they really were interested. It wasn't just a one-way proposition. The people of the caliber we were inviting there—were going to invite to our campus—would be having to make some decisions themselves whether they wanted to leave their present position and so on. And the relationship with the chancellor, was, I felt, very crucial here.

So this was agreed on, at first, by the committee. And when it came, for instance, to the situation where we were going out for interviews—that is, to visit campuses of our final people—this was all set. When I left, for instance, to go on a trip to the East, where I was gone for about five days, visited five campuses, five people, in the East. When this question came up, I explained to each one of these individuals, you know, they would get a chance to meet with the chancellor when they visited the campus if they were invited to visit the campus.

Well, when I got back from my trip—this was in February—in my absence, Bob Thompson had chaired a meeting in which the committee had decided that the chancellor would not meet with the individuals when they were invited here. And there had been apparently something going on in terms of pressure, you know, from JoDeen Flack and Richardson and others. So I was very upset when I heard this. We had a meeting scheduled right after I came back to hear my report. And I made a very strong plea to

the committee to rescind its action from the previous meeting, that I'd already informed the people that I'd visited that they would have a chance to meet the chancellor. And I reiterated, again, you know, the fact that I—you know, there was no way the chancellor was going to influence the committee. Well, the committee reversed itself completely at that meeting in the middle of February, and went back to the position which I thought we'd agreed on before I left.

And then this got immediate reaction from JoDeen Flack, and I'm sure Jim Richardson felt the same way she did, felt that I was apparently in cahoots with the chancellor and, you know, was involving him when he shouldn't be involved, and so on. So I had a phone call—it was on a Sunday night—we had a meeting of the committee scheduled for the next Monday morning; this was, I guess, middle of February meeting—and it was from JoDeen Flack, who went on and on about how she felt that we were kind of letting down the faculty, that there was strong feeling on the Faculty Senate that the chancellor should not be involved in this, you know, initial interview procedure. At the same time, we were going to, at our next meeting—in fact, it was the next day after she called me—we were also going to also decide on the procedures as far as the campus visitations, and there would be faculty representatives who would be involved in meeting with some of the people. And so she asked if she could attend the meeting just to find out about what the arrangements were going to be for the faculty representatives, then she would leave. So I agreed, you know, that she could come to the meeting.

Well, when she got to the meeting, right away she started in on the chancellor situation again. And I was very disturbed at this and, you know, let my emotions out, I think, in that situation, and told her that she had

been invited to the meeting, you know, for a particular purpose, that we had decided this question in terms of the visitation with the chancellor, we didn't want to open it up again 'cause it caused problems enough already in terms of the relationships of the, you know, members of the faculty. And I guess she was disturbed at the treatment she received. Of course, I was disturbed that she was using it as a forum to try and get over this position which I'd already discussed with her. And so she sent a letter to each member of the committee, oh, now proposing a "compromise" that when, or if we decided, that there be a member of the committee present at all times. [Laughing] Some way, I guess, she had the feeling that the chancellor was going to say things; there may be candidates he didn't like, to discourage them, and so on.

Well, I made the point again, once more, if we were going to end up getting or having candidates who were all very unacceptable to the chancellor, that we wouldn't be very far ahead in terms of effectiveness of the president, anyway. And this was a critical type of decision. Anyway, the committee didn't open up this question again. But that is the area, which, in terms of the procedures, caused the most problem and which we had the interference.

JoDeen Flack once mentioned to me, "I guess, you're getting all, you know, kinds of pressures."

And I told her, "Well, you know, about the only pressure we've received is from, you know, you and certain members of the Faculty Senate on this question." Now, later on, we received pressure in another direction by the academic deans in terms of selection procedure.

Well, in terms of the way in which we worked, in terms of making our decisions on the individual faculty members, we had

our individual presidential nominees. We had, total, around 400 nominations and applications, the applications coming almost entirely from responses to the ad in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, nominations coming mainly from presidents and from some faculty members on campus. There were some from other people; I think, too, probably some of these are set up. In other words, an individual who maybe saw the ad and then asked someone, maybe another institution to nominate him, felt it looks better, you know, if you're nominated rather than apply. And of those 400, there were about 270 who expressed interest in the position, either through directly applying or who were nominated and then when we wrote to ask them about their interest, they said yes, they would like to be candidates. And so it was a matter of then deciding how you narrow, you know, this down.

So what we did on the initial screening (and this took place over a period of several weeks), as we were receiving these applications and the nominees who agreed—. We asked in the ad, for instance, in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, if they're interested, to send us a vita with a list of references. And when we wrote to the nominees, we asked the same thing. In fact, for the nominees, too, we asked them to send us an abbreviated vita of one sheet, in addition to a larger one if they wanted. And then I had copies Xeroxed of that one summary kind of a vita, which we sent each member of the committee. So through the whole process, they received all of at least that vita summary. And the applicants, since we didn't have that provision in the *Chronicle* ad, about the one-page summary, I oftentimes did this myself. Or else if there were just a couple of pages which contained most of it, I would have two pages Xeroxed. Sometimes I'd have to write something in at the bottom

of the first or second page, indicating the number of publications or something of this nature. So each member of the committee had copies of that. And then also, as we received references later on, each member of the committee received a copy of each reference letter that came in. So we really used the Xerox machine in the president's office.

Incidentally, Chancellor Humphrey set it up so that we were able to use a secretary in the president's office. And we worked mainly with Mainly with Mrs. Agnes Heidtman in the president's office, who was very cooperative throughout the whole procedure.

So the committee had these vitas, and we did our initial screening mainly on these vitas. Now, I also had the more complete vitas, sometimes several pages, sometimes seven or eight pages, where they would list all their publications and all types of activities. So as we discussed each one, I could bring in some additional information, in addition to what they had in front of them. But the committee members knew ahead of the meetings which ones we were going to take up on this initial screening. And, I think, in just about every case they would have gone over these, you know, beforehand, before the meeting, and would have decided whether or not initially, at least, they thought we should pursue by asking for references.

And in this initial screening, most of the ones who were screened out were screened out on the basis of those criteria; those four criteria that we had agreed upon. A lot of them didn't have the higher administrative experience, even though this had been set forth in the ad and in the nomination letter. Some of them had—just recently had, you know, assumed positions— maybe just for a few months or a year; [the committee] didn't feel this was normally enough time to really evaluate them in that position. Some hadn't

had the full-time faculty experience, or their scholarly contributions were very weak, you know, maybe one article, or nothing which seemed to be, you know, substantial type of contribution.

So we made decisions on this basis. And on this basis, we screened them down out of that first list, to around, I think, it was about seventy-eight who survived out of that initial 270. And it was only on these seventy-eight candidates that we sent out for letters of reference. And so this, you know, greatly reduced the paper work. I understand Las Vegas actually sent out for references on anybody who was nominated or who applied, which really inundated them with a lot of paper work.

Well, then the next process was, as we received papers—and this was scattered over a period of weeks, too—as we had a complete file on an individual, we would set up—and usually this was a week ahead of time—a meeting on these, you know, seventy-eight. In maybe some cases, it'd be fifteen or twenty at a time that we would take up. And so I'd let them know a few days ahead which ones would be taken up, so that they could go through and come up with a rating on a one to ten scale, with one being the highest, and ten the lowest. And we discussed the individuals. Let's see, I think what we agreed on was to have a vote first, that is a rating first, and slips were distributed ahead of time. An individual would come, you know, with a name and a number on a slip, it was on kind of a secret ballot type of arrangement. Bob Tompson, who was a mathematician, he would then come out with the rating of the individual, in terms of what total he received. And then there would be discussion afterwards. In many instances, quite a few changes would be made. Individuals would then change their rating, and would so inform Bob Tompson.

So this was the procedure that we followed, going through this list of seventy-eight over a period of weeks. So by close to the end of January, we decided to cut this group down and then to do a re-rating on the top ones. And so we cut it off at forty; that is, individuals. With eleven members on the committee, this meant that they, you know, came out with oh, the average rating was something like 3.6, or whatever. And this cut it down to twenty-nine. And we then did a re-rating on these twenty-nine, this time changing it to a one to five rating procedure, with one being the highest and five being the lowest and feeling that if we changed the parameters here, that people'd be more likely to do a reassessment and not just vote the same way they'd voted the first time, in terms of the rating.

And so we followed the same procedure in terms of first rating these people, then having further discussion, and then having some changes, and out of this, came up with our top group. We decided then to visit—actually it was thirteen—the thirteen top people. We had some factors here that helped decide just how many we would visit and also how many we would eventually invite in.

We'd been given a budget by the Board of Regents of \$5,000, out of the "special projects fund" of the board. The \$5,000 was for visiting other campuses, bringing people, travel, so on for people coming in. And also for the expenses of luncheons and dinners and so on of the committee while entertaining the individuals who were our finalists.

This cost was in addition, of course, to the secretarial help, and all the Xeroxing, and so on, and telephone calls, which were all charged to the president's office, to the operating funds of the president's office. It was a feeling of the chancellor that this special projects money, which was not state

appropriated money should be used only for these types of activities, and that expenses which could legitimately be charged to operating in the president's office should be done in that way.

So actually in terms of the campus visits, we had a situation where Tom O'Brien—actually Tom O'Brien had a meeting down in southern California before we made this last type of rating, with our top twenty-nine. He had had a meeting there, and felt that since he was already going to that area, that he should visit two of our top people; that is two of the ones who were at the top in the first rating go-around, which he did. And we had the reports on those people then, before we made the one-to-five ratings. And I mention this because one of those who ended up in the top nine would not have been there, I think, if it hadn't been for this visit by Tom O'Brien. Leo Goodman-Malamuth from Long Beach, California State University at Long Beach, made a much more favorable impression personally than his papers had indicated. He was one who, I think, he had a rating of forty on the first go-around, he just barely made the top twenty-nine. But after Tom's report, he ended up being one of those who was invited to campus. So Tom had that visit.

And then we decided, in terms of the other visitations of our top people after we'd had these ratings—rather rating from one to five that—actually, I made the decision that I would take the long trip. So I went East to visit—see, it was actually four people in the state of New York and one in Massachusetts; that means we had five of our top twelve in that area.

Also, of the others, Tom O'Brien had a meeting at Arizona State, at Tempe; one of our top candidates was from Arizona State, and so he would visit him at that time and also would fly over from there to Little Rock,

Arkansas, to visit Max Milam. And then Bob McKee volunteered to make the swing to Colorado and Montana and Washington, to pick up three of our finalists. One was at Colorado State, one was at the University of Montana and the other one was at Eastern Washington state college. Then that left one other candidate to pick up, and here Sally Kees and Don Cecich volunteered to visit California State University at Chico, to visit Don Gerth. So really, the first two weeks of February were taken up with these—at least much of the time with these—visitations. Plus the fact that Tom O'Brien the later part of January, had already visited a couple of the people in southern California. Well, after the reports from the people who had visited the campus, we decided on inviting eight people.

I might mention here, in terms of the five people that I visited in the East, that the first one I visited was Joe Murphy, who was president of Queens College in the City University system in New York. And Murphy was very cautious about not wanting to have anything out on his campus, since he was president there. And so when I called him to try and set up a time, he was so tied up at various places, finally he asked me when I was coming in and I said, well, I was planning to come in on a Sunday evening, to New York City. And he said, "Well, I'll meet you at the airport and we can visit, you know, for a while that evening."

So he met me, with his wife, at the airport. And it was interesting. He said he would have a rain coat on his arm so I could identify him because, you know, JFK airport in New York—well, it turned out it was very cold and they just had a big snowstorm. So he was all bundled up with this big coat on, but he also had a rain coat on his arm so I [laughing] was able to identify him. And so he took me to the motel where I was staying

in Manhattan—motor hotel I guess it was. And so we visited for about four hours that night in the bar at this motor hotel. He and his wife were both very charming people. He had some of the kind of Kennedy charm and charisma. Eventually, in terms of the vote of the committee, after the campus visitations, he was the number one choice of the committee.

But I had a feeling all along that he probably wouldn't accept, you know, in the end. That he was already president, was making much more money than our position called for. I kept asking him why he was interested in this position—this was something that when he came to the campus, faculty groups and deans asked him as well. You know, why he is—interested. He mainly came out of, you know, the East and the Eastern establishment. He had been, oh, involved as a speech writer for Kennedy when he was a professor in Massachusetts. He also had been head of the Peace Corps in Ethiopia. He had been a personal assistant to John Gardner, and was very close to Sargent Shriver and the whole Kennedy group, and so on. And what I picked up from that initial meeting was that his wife wanted to get Out of New York City. They had children, one was a teenager, and a couple more were going to be teenagers soon. And she just wanted to get out of that environment. They had met at the University of Colorado as undergraduates and so they—you know, there was something about the West and so on, although he is from the East himself.

So that was my first visit. I was very impressed, but dubious about whether, you know, in the end, he would be willing to accept the position if offered.

I then went from there to Albany, upstate, University of New York at Albany, which was a very impressive campus. Oh, I missed something here—in that the day before, on

Monday following my visit with Murphy, I went to the Baruch College campus of the City University of New York and met with a Dr. Monat, who was the dean of the faculties at that time—was just a short time later made vice president, academic vice president of Baruch College. And Bill Monat had set things up in terms of visitations with people which, you know, it was a very nice meeting with him and yet I came away with the fact that he was so low-key that he just wasn't very—he was pleasant but he wasn't very out-going. And I just didn't see him as the presidential type.

And it was interesting, too, while there, I visited with the financial vice president of Baruch College, and I found out that he had formerly been vice chancellor of the City University system in New York. And I asked him if he knew Joe Murphy, and, he said: "Oh! Murphy!" He went on to say, in fact, that Murphy was by far the most effective of the twenty presidents of the City University—community colleges and four-year colleges. And so he really had, you know, great praise. And of course, it was quite evident that he felt that Monat wasn't really in the same class as Murphy. And they're entirely different. Murphy had, as he mentioned some of this Kennedy charisma and charm, and so on.

I also was, in the process, asked by this vice president if I'd like to see Queens College, which was where Murphy was. And Murphy had mentioned that if I'd like to come out and visit the college, I could talk to his assistant. He indicated he didn't want me talking to a lot of other people on campus. So I went out—was given a chauffeured drive out to the Queens campus by the vice president of Baruch College to see Queens. And I was surprised that the campus, at least the buildings, seemed to be as run down as they were, of course, because I had been told

this was really the nicest campus of the City University System. And of course, many of those campuses around in New York just, you know, old buildings and so on. At least this had some grass and had somewhat of a campus atmosphere. But it was nothing compared to what, you know, types of campuses in the West that we're used to.

So then I went from there the next day to Albany, where I met first with President Benezet, who was the president of the State University of New York at Albany. Of course, the interesting thing there was that, when I got out of graduate school in 1956, I went to Colorado College for an interview for a teaching position. And Benezet was president at the time. And so we started out chatting about the past, and he at least remembered my name from that, and the situation from that time. But he went on to speak very highly of his academic vice president—actually he was executive vice president and academic vice president—Phillip Sirotkin, whom I was there to interview. And in fact, he mentioned that when he was—you know, first arrived there and they were recruiting for a vice president and there was a faculty search committee, and so on, he threw the name of Sirotkin in after he had been told by a couple of his friends in California that this was the man that they thought the most of, in terms of interpersonal relationships, in an administrator.

And then I went in and visited with Sirotkin, had lunch with him, spent a total of about four hours with him, and came away *very* impressed. And he just seemed—I had the feeling that this man is really presidential timber. You felt like he would just do extremely well. And so I came back with very glowing accounts. I mean with Sirotkin. Once more, I had the feeling that there would be problems here salary-wise, because of the fact that he was already making several

thousand dollars more as vice president than what the presidency called for here.

Incidentally, even before I had gone on this swing and found out what some of the people were making, I had written a letter, in fact, the previous fall, not long after we got started on the search, to chairman of the board Jacobsen, asking for consideration of the salary question by the board, hoping that they would increase the salaries. It was a situation where the chancellor and the presidents of the four divisions all make exactly the same. And I guess the chancellor didn't feel like he could really initiate an increase because he was involved in it as well.

So from Albany I went to Syracuse, where I met with a man by the name of Paul Olscamp, who was vice president for student affairs. Now, he had also, previously, been vice president for academic affairs at Roosevelt University in Chicago, and had very strong letters of recommendation. He was the youngest of the group that we interviewed; he was only thirty-six years of age. He'd set up meetings with various of the administrators there at Syracuse. And some of them were very frank with me; they mentioned his strengths but also the fact that he was a very cocky individual, as they put it, and in some of his speeches he, you know, didn't come across too well, because he probably exuded so much self-confidence that, you know, that it rubbed people the wrong way.

And so I came back with the feeling that Olscamp, you know, just wasn't for us, as far as a candidate. Also, one of the vice presidents had mentioned to me that he ran his home in kind of patriarchal fashion and the wife, you know, was just in her place and she didn't speak up; she was very pleasant but she didn't have much to say because he kept her down. And so that, of course—when I reported that to the committee, that didn't go over well.

Then I went from Syracuse, flew into Providence, Rhode Island, where I was met by Dick Fontera. He had invited me, over the phone, when I first talked to him to stay at his home, because our time was going to be short and he was picking me up that evening, and I had to come back the next day. In fact, I had to leave from Boston around one o'clock the next afternoon. And so we were trying to work things out so that we could have a meeting. I was going to go back on Thursday, we were going to have a meeting on Friday and decide upon our people we were going to invite. What we were trying to do was to wind the search procedure up before the Easter vacation, because that would have set us back another week or so, and to get those nominations to the regents and the chancellor before then.

So he invited me to stay at his home. We got back to his home in North Dartmouth, Massachusetts. He was dean of the faculty at Southeastern Massachusetts University. Got back to his home about nine o'clock and I met his wife, who was a very, very charming—she stayed and talked with us for awhile. But we talked nonstop from nine o'clock at night until three in the morning. I finally had to kind of call things off. I mean he was so interested in everything that was going on, and he was just firing questions at me, you know, one thing after another.

So we ended up going to bed about three, and then getting up about seven, because he had meetings all set up for me at the university, to meet with other people. And in talking with the people on his campus, most of them, at least, were very enthusiastic. And some of the people I was impressed with that worked with him, the closest, including a black woman, a young woman, who was his assistant, who was just, you know, very enthusiastic about him. She drove me to the airport and so I

had a chance to talk with her, as well as deans and faculty members and students and so on. And I talked to the president, also. And an interesting thing there was the president of Southeastern Massachusetts University had been president of Idaho State University in Pocatello when I was on the search committee of Stanislaus State College, back in 1962. And he had been one of our finalists [laughing]. So here I meet him again back there. And he was very enthusiastic about Fontera.

I mentioned to him at the time, which I'm sure he relayed on to Fontera—well, I said, he's a type of person that I'm sure at least some of the members of our committee are really looking for. I mean, because here is a man who had this kind of charisma. And you could tell, it would be an exciting kind of place to work with an individual like this.

The thing that I was concerned about, as far as the acceptability to the board and to the chancellor, was the fact that he talks so long, you know, and that he would just maybe wear people out. And the president said, "Well, I know, this can be a problem." He says, "In fact, when he's talking before the board of regents or before a legislative committee, we have a little kind of signal worked out. And when I think he's maybe talking too fast, going too fast, I'll reach over and just put my hand on his arm. And that'll mean, you know, 'slow down.' And if I feel it's time for him to stop talking, this time I'll give his arm a squeeze, and that means, you know, 'wind it up'" [laughing]. And then he went on to say that, you know, he was a brilliant individual, that when he got into a problem for someone, he just, you know, dug into it and found out everything he could about it. And he just—. One of the things that our committee was looking for was somebody who would, you know, really not duck the hard decisions, you know, and not just put them off.

And so when I brought this up he said, [laughs.]

"*Duck 'em, he loves 'em*" You know, the challenge, you know, tough decision, and he said this—you know—"His enthusiasm is just *contagious!*"

And so I came back and, you know, reported to the committee on my observations. Now, I told them of Fontera, that I would personally, you know, would feel very good about having him on the slate. But I didn't think—I thought he would be too strong, you know, for the regents and board. Well, so I went into all the background—very strong on Affirmative Action, you know, and other areas.

So when we came to the decision of which ones to invite, I worked it out in terms of what money we had left. And I thought we could invite a total of eight, if we invited only two from the East, you know, because that's where we ran into most of the money in terms of the travel, and so on. So the committee agreed on Murphy and Sirotkin from the East, plus six others.

Now, the ones from California, two that Dean O'Brien had visited and then Gerth from Chico we kind of, you know, felt that they were close enough anyway and so it was natural to invite them. In terms of the three that were visited by McKee, we decided to invite the one from Colorado State and the one from Montana, not the one from Eastern Washington State College. And once more, one of the factors here was that he was so low-key. And was—seemed to be quite reserved, and so on. Nice fellow—but—. And then we invited Milam; Tom O'Brien had visited him in Arkansas. And O'Brien, originally, his number one candidate had been this man Collins from Santa Barbara, who was the dean of the graduate school there. But after he visited Milam, he said, "Oh, this is my number

one man.” We invited Collins, too, as well as Milam. And so we agreed on those eight.

As for the first three visits to the campus, I set up the times and the dates to try to work things out with the candidates’ schedules, plus the chancellor’s schedule, and our own schedule.

The first one who came in was Ogden from Colorado State. He was going to be in Reno to give a speech to the Bureau of Land Management conference and so we just invited him to visit us at that time. So Ogden was first, then Goodman-Malamuth from Long Beach, and then the third one—let’s see—was Collins from Santa Barbara.

Well, as it turned out, these individuals ranked near the bottom of the nine, you know, in the end. And some of the members of the committee, in terms of what reactions they got from the faculty representatives and the members of the Academic Council who were invited to meet separately with the individuals, and also they met with student groups, the reactions were somewhat negative. And there was kind of a panicky feeling, you know [laughs]. Are we going to come up with enough candidates, you know, given the fact that some may not be interested in following up?

So we had a meeting. I worked it out budget-wise where it looked like we could have invited one more. And the vote was to invite Fontera. And the interesting thing here, in terms of the final result, that after—well, that he ended up as the second choice of the committee, and after Murphy resigned—withdraw—he ended up the top choice of the committee. Even though he was a late add, you know, as far as one invited to the campus. And so we had those nine that came to the campus.

One of the problems that came up near the end of the visitations by the presidential

candidates was that of the position of Acting President Jim Anderson. He had been nominated, as I believe I mentioned earlier, by one faculty member; also a former student had mentioned his name in a letter to us. I think perhaps a lot of people felt it was just—he would automatically be considered and therefore we didn’t receive a lot of letters about him.

But, oh, in about the middle of the visitations of the various candidates, we started getting some reactions from some of the deans. And some of them mentioned well, they didn’t think that, you know, these candidates really had that much to offer. I heard that one mentioned oh, Anderson was better than any of the ones that had come so far. One of the academic deans, Dale Bohmont of Agriculture, was also nominated and stated that he wanted to be considered. In fact, there were only two on-campus nominees who agreed to be candidates, Bohmont and Acting President Anderson. There were several other people who were nominated; that is, several other people on campus who were nominated. Bob Gorrell was one of these, and Bob declined. I think personally that Gorrell probably would have had more support on the committee than any of the other campus candidates. But he declined to be considered and he stated age as one of the factors. I believe Gorrell is about sixty now, and he felt that was perhaps a little too old to start [laughs] off on a new career as president of a university.

Anderson was the one which there was the most interest, certainly. There were some other on-campus candidates. Some of these we wondered about in terms of, one faculty member sent us a long list of candidates and we didn’t know if he was really serious about some of these. In fact, we had to follow up; the committee asked me to follow up and

find out if he was serious. For instance, he had nominated "Wild Horse" Annie [Velma Johnston], who was, you know, champion of the Nevada mustangs and so on. And also he had nominated Jessie Beck of the Riverside Hotel, in addition to a number of faculty members, including both Gardners in psychology who are involved in research with chimpanzees, and so on. So we wondered if he was really serious. We asked him, he came back and said he was serious, but he said it would be up to the committee to decide which ones we'd want to pursue. So what the committee decided to do was to ask any of those who were faculty members, whether they wished to be considered. We didn't pursue the others. So, this meant, in terms of his list, that we contacted Jim Hulse, Maurice Beesley from Math, Bob Laxalt from the University Press. And then there was a man by the name of Thorp, who was a professor of mathematics at one of the University of California campuses; he had written a book on how to beat the dealer, which had received a fairly good sale in Nevada. I guess he had come into Nevada and worked out the odds and so on—especially, I guess this was "21." Anyway, we wrote all these people and the ones who did reply, most did reply and declined to be considered. Actually, we didn't receive a large number of nominations for on-campus people. Just this one faculty member had actually sent us the most, and they proceeded to decline.

So we had, I might say, in addition to Anderson, we had a nomination of Ken Young who had been vice president at the University of Nevada, I believe from 1960 to 1964, and who had gone from here to be president at one of the State University of New York campuses at Cortland. I believe he was there for four years and then went to Washington as vice president of the American College Testing Service.

Well, Ken Young had some strong support on the committee and at the beginning I thought he, you know, had a good chance of being one of the final candidates. Now, I had talked to Ken in Washington when I went to an American Council on Education meeting in Washington in October, just after, really, the committee had been selected. And Ken, of course, had heard that Edd Miller had accepted a position in Maine. And I asked him about whether he would be interested in being a candidate. And he at first talked to me along the line that, he and his wife, Mae, thought that they'd really like to get back to the University and to the Reno area. However, he didn't know about another presidency. He had had this opportunity, he had had a rough time at Cortland, where he had been sent to really convert what had been a teachers college for physical education instructors into a full-fledged liberal arts college. And so he had had a rough four years there. But then, after I talked to him for a couple of hours, toward the end, he was beginning to think well, you know, maybe the challenge would be great and he should consider it.

Well, later on when I did write him (after he had been nominated by a couple of Reno campus faculty members), he said he wanted to be considered. I think there was a feeling on the part of some of the committee that he, you know, the desire to get back to the area and the University was more important than the challenge of the presidency. Or he may have had some questions in terms of wanting to get into that.

But what we found—for instance, Tom O'Brien and Bob Tompson and myself had known him quite well and thought very highly of him. In fact, the previous presidential search committees, of which I had been a member (of the committee in California) Ken Young was one of our final

candidates, in addition to this Walker, who I encountered in Massachusetts again. And so there was some strong sentiment in favor of Ken Young. However, there were also some negative factors. Pat Fladager, who was the staff representative, felt that he was too much of a “nit-picker,” as she put it, in terms of the way in which he dealt the staff while he was here as vice president. The student body president, Terry Reynolds, had picked up some negative things in terms of the way he dealt with students at Cortland when he was president there. And also, on campus, I found out that he had alienated some people, especially from the professional schools felt that he was biased towards arts and sciences; that he had come out in favor of combining the Engineering college and the School of Mines at the time when Scheid [Vernon E., Dean, Mackay School of Mines, emeritus] would retire, and have just one dean. And this had antagonized the people in Mines who wanted to keep the separate school of mines.

And so, I think it was generally agreed that he was a good administrator; in other ways, there were certain antagonisms that came out. So when it came to the selection process he—there’s no question in terms of the initial screening that he passed that, and we pursued with the references and so on. But when it came to the initial ratings, he was down the line, as were both Bohmont and Anderson. And there’s no question that with those two individuals that everybody on the committee knew either them fairly well or knew of them. And so when you have on-campus candidates like that, you’re likely to have the weaknesses as well as the strengths being very much involved in the decision.

Well, getting back to this problem that developed in the middle of the presidential visits, there was a meeting, a special meeting, of the Academic Council called. Now, I don’t

know what all went on behind the scenes, but I understand that George Smith from the Medical School, the dean of the Medical School, was the one who requested that there be a special meeting of the Academic Council, to discuss the candidates. The interesting thing here is that Smith never attended any of the meetings to meet—he didn’t meet a single candidate even though he was invited for every one. And apparently he was leading this fight to have reconsideration of Anderson. There also were rumors we picked up that Smith and Tom Tucker, professor of education, were going directly to the regents and were thinking in terms—or trying to convince the regents they knew they shouldn’t accept anyone who was recommended by the committee, if Anderson were not on the list. I don’t say that was just a rumor we picked up; JoDeen told me that she had talked with Tucker at length and asked him not to pursue his efforts in this regard.

But at any rate, this was sweeping around the campus, you know, certain rumors of this type. This was all happening, you know, toward the end. The interesting thing is that earlier in the process, rumors were, you know, Anderson was going to be in as president, and this was just window dressing, you know, going through this procedure. But it was quite evident to me from the initial discussions, that Anderson would not be one of the final candidates. It just wasn’t the sentiment there on the committee.

So at any rate, a special meeting was set up of the Academic Council. The interesting thing for us, too, was that Jim Anderson had told Tom O’Brien, who, of course, was a member from the Academic Council who was on the Search Committee, that he thought he should not be present at the meeting because he was involved. Well, that made us wonder if they were just going to discuss the presidential

candidates, you know, because Anderson had been eliminated after the first ratings.

Incidentally, this is going back a little, but what we had to decide at the time that Anderson and Bohmont both came out fairly low in the ratings—after they passed, of course, the initial screening, but in the first ratings from a one to ten basis by each of the candidates—was whether we should inform them before the visits of the other—. In terms of the decision within the committee as to what to do, as far as the two on-campus candidates, we discussed at length whether or not we should send them letters notifying them that they were no longer being considered before the candidates came on campus, or whether we should wait until later—in other words, you know, let 'em still feel that there was a possibility until later on. The committee decided—I don't know that there was anyone really dissenting on this at the time that the decision was made—that it would be better to let them know beforehand, that it would be a better arrangement as far as having them meet with the candidates and so on, if they were not looking upon themselves as in competition with these individuals. And it would clear the air.

Well, there's been some discussion since then, whether this was really the right thing to do. Especially, apparently, some of those who were very friendly to Anderson's candidacy, especially among the deans and others outside who heard about it. Anderson apparently talked to quite a few people right after receiving the letter, so it wasn't something that he just kept to himself. And it did stir up some sympathy for him. And also, some of the deans mentioned they didn't think that was "the way to do it." He should have been "treated equally with the candidates who were brought on campus and "should have been interviewed," and so on. He was the acting president and so on, and they "should have

given him that courtesy." But at any rate, the decision was to do it the other way.

Well, at this Academic Council meeting, there were some criticisms of the procedures, apparently, that were followed. Some of the academic deans felt that they should have had access to the papers on the individual candidates before they came on campus. And the reason that we didn't do this (and I guess I was the main one who pushed for not distributing the background papers on each individual, as it were), [was] trying to keep—as much as possible—the names out of the newspapers and so on, and if they actually had something in writing, this would have been very easy to pass on to the newspapers. And so what we had told the deans, as well as the faculty representatives, or the student representatives [was] that if they wanted to know the names ahead of time, we would inform them; they could then, perhaps, look them up in *Who's Who in America* or whatever, if they wanted some background, but that we didn't want to circulate papers or anything official with their names on it to, you know, a large number of people.

There had been a problem, back at the time that President Miller had been selected with leaks to the newspapers which caused problems for candidates back on their home campuses and so on. And so we were trying to kind of walk the tightrope here between furnishing some information and allowing a cross section of the various groups on the campus to meet with the candidates, but at the same time not—you know, trying to preserve some confidentiality as far as the news media. And this worked out very well. And, of course, we had the cooperation of the *Sagebrush* editor, which was important here. Terry Reynolds had talked to him beforehand and he agreed not to press for names or print names. And so this certainly helped.

But in addition to this, there was the move at this Academic Council meeting to pass a resolution to the presidential search committee, to be delivered by Tom O'Brien, who was present at the meeting, to reconsider the candidacy of Acting President Anderson. So this was delivered to me by Tom O'Brien. And at that time, it was nearing the end of the visitations and the next scheduled meeting of the committee and the only time we were going to be able to get together without—because we were having visitations back to back, one candidate would leave one day and another would arrive the next. (In fact, one time I put one on the plane at ten o'clock and met the other one at noon coming in; it was almost overlapping procedure.) I told Tom, "Well, the next time we're going to meet as a whole is when we are going to consider which candidates, which three, we're going to recommend. And we can bring it up at that time, in terms of whether we want to reconsider."

Well, when it did come up at that meeting, I suggested that we reconsider, and that what we do then would be to rate Anderson on a one to five basis, just as we had our final group—twenty-nine, I believe it was—and, you know, that there would be no harm done there. Because we had previously agreed that if any one committee member wanted to put anybody into that final group for that final rating on a one to five, that we would consider it.

So I suggested that this be done. Bob Thompson so moved that this be done, although he stated at the time that his feelings hadn't changed, you know, about the Anderson candidacy. But he moved that there be reconsideration. There was not even a second on the committee. And so it died right there. So we did take it up as requested by the

academic deans, but there just wasn't support for even having another vote, you know, on Anderson's candidacy.

So it was interesting here, too, at the time that I passed the names on to Chancellor Humphrey of our three choices. I did it first by phone because he was making plans for an Eastern trip and wanted to try to visit the campuses of the individuals. He was aware of the resolution that had been passed by the Academic Council and he asked me how the committee had reacted. And I informed him that we did take it up but that there was no sentiment for changing.

I wonder why, with such a representative committee, there was so little support for him and there was such strong support in the Academic Council?

I don't know just how strong the support was in the Academic Council. You know, it'd be pretty difficult to pin this down. There's some who definitely were. I think especially after talking with many of the candidates, I think some of them felt, you know, they would be more comfortable with Anderson. In the case of George Smith, I think he has felt that Anderson has treated the Medical School very well, very fairly, and that he wondered, you know, what would happen with a new man coming in. So it's hard to, you know, figure this out. Of course, even in terms of the vote, as I understand it, in the Academic Council on the resolution, there was a voice vote and there were no negatives. But when you've got the situation, too, where you have a man who is academic vice president and the deans report to him, and in an open meeting—especially the way the word gets around on this campus—for somebody to take a stand against him on the academic deans, it wouldn't, you know, look too well there anyway.

Another point here, and one that Mary Ellen Glass brought out, too, before the regents, was the fact that in terms of the references for Anderson, that they were just, you know, not as enthusiastic as the references we had for other people. But I don't think this was the major factor in terms of the decision. I think it was basically that individuals felt he was just not as strong a president as we should have. Some who have served on various committees with him and so on have found that he didn't have much to contribute—you know, in certain statewide committees. And of course, maybe part of this was because he was fairly new to a kind of total university administration and was, you know, just not up on certain things. But he did not give the impression, at least to the committee members, that he would, you know, provide the strong type of leadership that they were looking for.

In terms of other pressures we received—we didn't really receive any pressure on Bohmont except we did receive a letter which was from the department chairmen in the College of Agriculture, supporting Bohmont's position. But in his case, as I may have mentioned before, we felt that Bohmont would have been strong outside in terms of relationships with community and with legislators and so on, but that he had his internal problems with his faculty. We felt that he was too autocratic at times in the way in which he dealt with his faculty internally which wouldn't have gone—well, it would have gone even less well with Arts and Science faculty and others.

Well, in terms of the final meeting, which was incidentally held while Joe Murphy was still in the city, we had a problem here where we were up against a time situation. We decided to meet, as a committee, in the afternoon of Thursday, April 4, to make our

choices as far as the three nominees to make to the chancellor and the Board of Regents. And the reason we decided on that particular date was that Tom O'Brien was at a meeting in southern California during that week; he apparently thought that we would be through by the first week in April, and had gone ahead with the schedule; of course, this had been made some months before. And an interesting thing here, too, was that the O'Briens were meeting with the Andersons, Jim Anderson and his wife, for a Mexican vacation, starting the next day on Friday, April 5. But he said he could fly back for a meeting on the afternoon of April 4. So what we had set up was to have Joe Murphy meet with the chancellor the afternoon of April 4, and the chancellor said he also would show him around town a little, and that we then could pick Murphy up at around five o'clock and then take him to the cocktail party which we had scheduled. And then I would have dinner with him at the airport as we put him on the plane. But in the meantime, we would know, you know at that time, at the cocktail party and so on, whether he was one of the finalists.

So we had the meeting the afternoon of April 4, so that everybody could be in attendance. And the procedure we decided on was to first have each member of the committee—eleven members of the committee—list the individuals that they would feel like they'd want to have on the list of nominees to the Board of Regents. And this could be, should be up to five. Because we could submit three or four—the Code called for us to submit at least three. So there was no limit on how many we could. And so we, basically, it was to test to see how many of the candidates of the nine who had visited the campus, you know, that had support—that individuals would be willing to support them for the presidency.

Well, in terms of that list, there was one candidate, Murphy, who was listed on all eleven ballots and so it looked like he was certainly one of the top ones. And then Gerth and Fontera were listed on nine. And then Sirotkin was listed on seven. And then Milam and Landini, I guess, were on six. So then the question was, you know, where do we go from here? This just gave us an indication of the ones who were most acceptable.

And then we decided that we would do a rating of these top six, the six who were named on a majority, you know, of the individuals' nomination slips. So then we decided to actually rate them; that is, actually to rank them, in other words, one, two, three, four, five, six. And everybody had to rank all of them if we were going to work this out numerically. And so we went through that ranking. And Murphy came out first in the rankings. In fact, it came out just about, you know, what'd come out originally. Fontera was second, Gerth was third, Sirotkin was fourth, Milam was fifth, and Landini was sixth. Of course, one of the interesting things here, too, was that Sirotkin probably would have been one of the top ones if it hadn't been that we received some adverse information from the University of Montana search committee, which had sent some people back to his campus. Just before the vote, O'Brien had been gone for a few days, he had this letter [from a member of the Montana committee] with him (he's dropped by his office before he came to the meeting), and that was enough, apparently, to cause a drop in what ordinarily otherwise would have been a higher ranking for Sirotkin, who impressed just about everyone very much on his appearance.

But Sirotkin was also the candidate that, I think, most of us felt was least likely to accept. And that may have influenced some of the judgment. But there was a question here then

of, you know, where do we have the cut-off? Do we just submit the three that we have to submit, or should we submit a couple more? Since we felt that, you know, in the case of Sirotkin, he was not likely to accept, and there was some question about Murphy at the time (it was expressed), whether he would really accept. The final decision was to submit the three names, the first three, Murphy, Fontera, and Gerth. And then the committee gave me the authority to submit Sirotkin's name as a replacement, in case any of the three declined to be candidates at that stage. And beyond that, we would have to have another meeting of the committee to decide that if more than one more resigned.

There was also apparently a mix-up at this point in time, from my understanding of what the committee decided. Because it was my understanding that they asked me to write the other members—other than these top four—and inform them that the selection had been made. I had previously written all but the top twenty-nine, telling them, and so I proceeded to write the actually twenty-five or so, other than the top four.

What I did was to call the individuals on Friday to make sure they were interested—the three top choices. Although, in the case of Murphy, I didn't have to call him because he was there for the cocktail party and so I just informed him and he agreed that he wanted to be a candidate. And Fontera, when I called him, was overjoyed that he was on the top three. Gerth said he was very happy to be one of the top three.

And then that same night, I called Chancellor Humphrey, told him the first three names. He asked me about Sirotkin. That was the only one he asked about, you know, whose name wasn't on, because he had been very impressed with Sirotkin. I told him that the situation was that Sirotkin was the next in

line in case, you know, one of them dropped out. And he also acted a little surprised that Fontera was on the list. I think once more, the fact that Fontera talked so much, he hadn't made that good of an impression with Humphrey. He [Humphrey] spoke about his difficulty getting a word in edge-wise with [Fontera].

So the next day, I took down the folders for the individuals. But what happened as far as the chancellor's office, which may have had some consequences later on— I don't know whether it made any difference or not. I certainly wasn't planning to write Sirotkin because I thought we might be putting him in right away, you know, in case one of them declined. But I found out later that the chancellor had decided to write Sirotkin and tell him that he was the "first alternate." We hadn't designated him as such; it was just a matter he would be.

Then the next week, I got a call from the chancellor, saying that Gerth had decided to back out. He didn't want to be a candidate. And there was a personal consideration. This is, I believe, on a Thursday. The next day, Friday, Gerth called me and talked to me about it, and said it was completely personal, something he should have worked out with his family before he even came over. I had the idea that his family just didn't want to move.

And so in the meantime, after the chancellor had called me on Thursday I said, "Well, go ahead with Sirotkin." Now, when I talked to the chancellor on Friday, he said that Sirotkin was going to call him back on Monday to tell him for sure whether he wanted to be a candidate. And he mentioned that Sirotkin was a little upset that he wasn't in the top three, because he had received this letter saying he was an "alternate" and that he had been he thought, you know, felt very

good about the University and so on. He still didn't know which way he should go, because his presidency was opening up at Albany the next year, and also he had been nominated for the University of Oregon for presidency for—that is, for the '75 year. And that he was also a finalist at Portland State University. So there were all kinds of options he had and he didn't know whether to go or not.

But I also called—after I talked to the chancellor— I called Sirotkin and told him that I thought, you know, the committee had been very favorably impressed with him here. And that perhaps one of the reasons why he was not in the top three originally was that the committee—many of the committee members—felt that he was not likely to accept, and that that had been one factor.

Well, at any rate, what happened then was that the chancellor then asked me for Sirotkin's papers and then sent out copies of Sirotkin's papers to the Board. Now, if I'd been in the chancellor's shoes I would have waited until Monday to have heard definitely from Sirotkin before he did this. Well, what happened then in the meantime, was that on Sunday, Gerth called the chancellor and said he wanted back in. And in the meantime—so the chancellor called me on Monday and said, "Well, here what do we do? I've already written Sirotkin, or already called Sirotkin and told him that he was now one of the candidates, and now Gerth wants back in."

And I said, "Well, why don't you wait until you hear from Sirotkin, you know before—? We may not have a problem." And so he called me back later that afternoon and said Sirotkin had called and said he didn't want to be a candidate. So I said, "Okay, we'll go back with our original three."

But I think this in-and-out business didn't help Gerth at that point. And especially, you know, where all of Sirotkin's papers had

been sent and everything. And maybe if the chancellor had waited to send the papers and all, that they wouldn't have had to have known, you know, that Gerth was in and out in that way.

So then we stayed that way in terms of the three candidates, and it looked like we were going to make it through to the regents meeting. The regents meeting was scheduled for the first Saturday in May. About a week before that, it was a Friday, that last Friday in April, I had a call from the chancellor's office saying that he had a wire from Murphy saying that he had to resign from his candidacy because of personal and professional reasons. He said a letter would follow.

So here we were, you know, just a week away. I called a meeting of the committee for that afternoon. I just had to call around and in fact, we never did locate Student Body President Terry Reynolds, so he missed the meeting. Bob McKee was out of town, although he had left a note with me saying that in case there was a need for replacement how he would vote.

So we met to decide who was to be the replacement for Murphy, because we had to have the three candidates for the Board of Regents. So after a preliminary discussion of the individuals who were left—there were five candidates—that is, five who had visited the campus who were still left. There was a question of just how we should go about making the decision. And we decided finally to just have a vote once again, a ranking one, two, three, four, five with everybody having to rank everyone. And in this voting, Milam came out well above the others and he appeared therefore to be the clear favorite as far as a replacement. The question then was, you know, should we choose a second or third one in case, you know, Milam or the next one would not be willing to be a candidate?

Well, the committee decided it'd be better for us to find out first whether Milam would accept the nomination, rather than try to fight it out from there. Because there were some strong reservations that committee members had on all the last four.

In the meantime, I had written Milam, you know, and told him that we submitted our three. I had mentioned that I hoped he would still be willing to be considered, in case there were another nomination to be made. But I was able to get him at his home in Little Rock—it was evening by that time in Arkansas. And he sounded very pleased to be nominated, after having written him, you know, that he was not a candidate. I didn't know because he hadn't been one of the names—didn't know just what kind of a reaction we'd get from him. But he was very, very cordial and very gracious about it. Said he'd be very pleased, you know, to be a candidate.

So I then proceeded to call the chancellor and informed him and then took down his papers later that same afternoon, so that he could get them out that weekend to the members of the Board of Regents. So this was, you know, just a week before the candidates were to come in. In fact, this was on Friday and the candidates had been invited to come in on a Thursday evening and then spend all day Friday in interviews—at least a portion of the day on Friday—interviews with the regents and then a party, with all of them together Friday night, all the candidates and their wives.

Perhaps I should mention that I didn't have any contact with the candidates, other than the conversation with Gerth and the time I called each one of them originally (I mean from that standpoint when Gerth called to tell me that he was not going to be a candidate and, of course, then came back

in). Except for Fontera. And Fontera called me several times during this period of about four weeks, in between the time that I called him and notified he'd been accepted and the final meeting with the regents.

The first time that I heard from him after I'd called him to say that he was one of the nominees, he was very upset because Neil Humphrey had cancelled his visit to his campus. I mentioned that Humphrey left the weekend after we submitted the names to him for a meeting in New York. And he did meet with Murphy on his campus, the Queens College campus in New York. And had planned to go up the next day to visit the campus in Massachusetts, Southeastern Massachusetts University where Fontera was dean of the faculty. But Fontera said that he had received a call from Mrs. Smotony, the chancellor's secretary, stating that the chancellor wouldn't be able to come to North Dartmouth, Massachusetts. And so Fontera was concerned, feeling that maybe the chancellor was writing him off, you know, as the one he would nominate to the board, because he wasn't even going to visit his campus. And I tried on the phone to assure him that this probably wasn't the case and that I knew he had a tight travel schedule and had to be back here at a certain time. And then Fontera said, well, they were having snow back there and, you know, maybe this would even further complicate the situation. And it is an out-of-the-way place to get to, North Dartmouth. You have to fly in either to Providence, Rhode Island or Boston, Massachusetts. And so I tried to assure him from that standpoint. But once more, there was no question he was the one who was most interested and most enthusiastic, you know, about the possibility of the presidency here. And then he had stated that the chancellor had asked him for names of people he

might call on the campus, in lieu of personal visitation to the campus. That he'd given him these three names including the president and faculty Senate chairman and, I guess a dean. Plus the chairman of the Board of Regents, the Board of Trustees.

Then he called me oh, a week or so later, to state that he [Humphrey] hadn't called anybody, you know, on the campus, and he was beginning to get concerned about that. And also, he mentioned that he had received a letter from the chancellor outlining what the visitation was to consist of. And the thing that shocked him there was that there was to be this cocktail party and dinner with all of the candidates and their wives together. And he had never heard of anything like this, in terms of [laughs] of this type of competition. And so I mentioned to him that I thought well, maybe, you know, this came out of a talk I'd had with the chancellor, where he spoke of the method, the procedure they'd used in Las Vegas, and the fact that it seemed to be a rather stilted conversation when the wife would come in for an interview at the end of the interview with the candidate. And I had mentioned to the chancellor that maybe he could think of something a little more informal, you know, ways in which to meet the wives. And I guess this is what he decided on, this type of a social.

So then later on, Fontera had informed me of when he was coming in, and so on. So I did have some contact, three or four phone calls from him, during this period of time. He told me, too (he mentioned this at the time that I told him he was one of the nominees), that he was a poor "waiter" and he hated to have that four weeks in there before they find out, you know, what was going to happen.

So as I understand it, things went much better, I think, than the candidates expected, at this gathering. They had four tables of six

each at the Humphrey home, where they had the cocktail party and the dinner. And they had it so the candidates were separated and then at the fourth table, Acting President Anderson was there. So he wasn't at the table with any of the candidates. And they had the members of the Board of Regents, and their wives. And spouses, I should say, because some of them are ladies; although Nedra Joyce wasn't there; Helen Thompson was, but she's not married. (This was another thing that Fontera mentioned to me on the phone originally, that he was very strong on Affirmative Action. They'd mentioned that the regents and their wives would be present and he [laughing] he said, "I know there are a couple of regents that are women," and this didn't seem to fit in, either.) But he mentioned to me afterwards—in fact, it was on the phone call I had with him just before he left after visiting, after the interviews with the regents—that he thought the thing went as well as it could have gone under the circumstances, but that he still didn't think it was a good idea that, you know, they'd throw everybody together like that. He said it came out, you know, not nearly as traumatic experience as they might have thought. And apparently, his wife, especially—Fontera's wife—hit it off beautifully with the chancellor and that type of thing.

I just got this from Fontera's standpoint. But no one else mentioned it. But I think apparently the regents thought it went off, you know, very well. There was no traumatic experience for them, certainly [laughs]. So they had that meeting Friday night.

And then the next morning, we met with the Board of Regents. And this was on the Saturday, May the 4th, I believe it was. And the meeting with the regents, I thought, went quite well. Seven of the nine regents were present. Fred Anderson was a little late, but

the two missing were Nedra Joyce from Las Vegas, whose daughter had been in a serious automobile accident a little earlier that week. And then Reverend Kohn, who had just returned from a trip to Israel. So those were the two missing regents.

But Chairman Harold Jacobsen started out by saying that they thought, you know, they'd follow somewhat the same format as they had with the search committee at the Las Vegas campus. And so he asked me first to go into some of the background in terms of the procedures which we used. And then there were some specific questions, for instance, about why there weren't any local candidates on the list. And I spoke to this question and mentioned, without stating the names, that there were only two who had agreed to become nominees, of those who were nominated. That is, really become candidates. And the feelings of the committee as I've you know, expressed them previously. And this seemed to satisfy the regents; they didn't press on that particular issue.

Then they decided to go around the semi-circle [gesture meaning shape of table] as far as the members of the committee, with each committee member expressing his feelings about each of the three finalists; of course, the three finalists by this time being Fontera, Gerth, and Milam.

And the first to express their positions were Bob McKee and Terry Reynolds, both of whom placed Gerth first. (This was another thing. Jacobsen, although they asked us for an unranked slate, then asked each individual at this meeting to rank the candidates on an individual basis.)

The next one was Mary Ellen Glass. And she spoke favorably about all three and said she could not make a choice as far as rankings.

And I started out—I was next—I started out by saying I thought each one of them

would make an excellent president and I went over some of the strengths that I saw of the three of them. And I closed by saying that if I were to have a first choice, it would probably be because his enthusiasm was contagious in terms of how enthusiastic he was about the job, and that I would put Fontera first. And the other two, that I would not rank, but figure them both strong. Strongly behind Fontera.

So the next committee member, the one who was sitting on my left was Judy Nash, who was the Alumni representative. And there was no question in terms of where Judy's sentiments lay. She had made this plain in terms of our discussions previously, in terms of our final selections. But she felt that Dick Fontera was, she felt, by far the strongest candidate. And so she made a very strong pitch for him. And I think maybe some of the other members of the committee felt she went overboard in terms of she was so flowery and was so strong about Fontera's attributes. But she felt from the standpoint of the alumni and the community as a whole, his speech-making capabilities and his great enthusiasm would be a great benefit to the University.

Well, then the next one after Judy was Ralph Young, who was a faculty representative from Agriculture. And Young generally was positive about all three. He said if he were forced to rank them, he would put Fontera first.

Next was a student member, Don Cecich. And Cecich came out with Fontera as his first nominee.

Well, by this time it was beginning to look like the bandwagon rolling for Fontera with four in a row putting Fontera as their first choice.

And then it came to Tom O'Brien, and O'Brien came out very negatively on Fontera. And some of us felt that he went too far in this regard, that he had not stated that

type of opposition before in the committee. And some felt that maybe it was a way of kind of helping to knock down the front runner, as far as, you know, there seemed to be momentum building up for Fontera, as far as the committee members who had been speaking before him. And he made the comments like, you know, Fontera kind of drove him up the wall because he talked so long, was so verbose. He also commented on a statement I had made where I had stated that when I visited...

And she was very strong for Fontera. And so her position was that Fontera would be the best of the three.

So the committee was divided. And we had never, you know, decided on beforehand about how we were going to talk to the regents. In fact, this question had come up at a previous meeting, and I felt the best procedure was for each one to just state his feelings and not try to go in with any kind of a pat arrangement, you know. Even if one had been possible, and given the way they expressed themselves on the various candidates, I don't think it would have been possible to have agreed on say, one candidate, you know, to push. So each of the three had support out of various committee members.

And there were some additional questions by the board members. After this, you could perhaps perceive from some of the questioning who was kind of leaning toward whom, you know, as far as the situation. I had the feeling that Bill Morris and Dr. Lombardi were favorable to Fontera, and that Jacobsen and Buchanan were negative about Fontera, by just the way in which they reacted to things that O'Brien said about Fontera.

And so we left the meeting, when the meeting broke up, not knowing just how this was going to come out. When some of us gathered together outside of the Center

for Religion and Life, where the meeting was held, the regents were continuing to meet and made their decision. At that time, there were certain things that were exchanged there which caused some of us to maybe think one might have an advantage over the others. For instance, Bob Thompson mentioned that Mel Steninger had come up to him right after we had broken up and said that his favorite was Milam, also. Because Thompson had mentioned that his favorite was Milam. Mary Ellen Glass mentioned to us that the chancellor had stated that there were two of the wives who were very lukewarm about coming here. And we kind of put that together to mean that the other two were other than Fontera, because we knew Iris Fontera and her husband were both enthusiastic about it. Later I asked the chancellor about this. And he said, no, it was only Mrs. Gerth who was negative. That is, they picked this up from that social evening, some of the comments she made about how she didn't want to leave Chico and so on. Of course, that was pretty obvious in terms of the reason why Gerth resigned in the first place.

So at any rate, some came away from the meeting thinking that Fontera had a good chance, partially because he had more supporters on the committee, partially because it came out in the kind of coffee period we had with the regents that Iris Fontera had made a big hit with the regents and the chancellor, and maybe that would counterbalance some of this negative about the verbosity of Dick Fontera.

Mary Ellen Glass made the statement while we were talking outside the meeting, that she felt confident after the meeting that it would be Milam. But she was the only one that, you know, openly expressed that position.

Ruth G. Hilts: Did she say why she thought that?

She just had the feeling, I guess, in terms of the way in which they reacted.

Now, I didn't get the clue completely, but right after the meeting when Chancellor Humphrey came over where some of us were having coffee, and I was standing, talking with Tom O'Brien and he made the statement—the chancellor did—that these comments had been of great help to him. Now later on, as I put this into perspective, I think he was talking mainly to Tom O'Brien, and O'Brien's comments which were negative to Fontera and positive, very positive, to Milam. Probably it was what the chancellor wanted to hear, because he had been somewhat turned off to Fontera in the interview when Fontera visited the campus, and had gotten along very well with Milam, and was very impressed with Milam. And so I think, after hearing several people talk mainly about Fontera, he was happy to hear O'Brien's statement which did give him some negative outcome. Which, of course, we all knew the—perhaps you might call it a weakness in terms of perhaps talking too long, but as in the case of Ralph Young, when he mentioned this, he said that he enjoyed it. You know, in other words, he enjoyed all the points he made along the way, even though it took him a little longer than some others to answer a question and so on. So that was the situation on Saturday.

The next thing I heard—well, it was the next day, I had a call from Pat Fladager, asking me if I'd heard anything. And she was on pins and needles and, of course, she was still hoping that Fontera had a chance. Then late in the afternoon on Sunday, I received a call and it was from Fontera. And he said he had just talked with the chancellor and then he asked me if the chancellor had called me and I

said, no, I hadn't heard from him. Well, he was Quite surprised that the chancellor wouldn't have informed me before he contacted the individual.

And so he went on to tell me that the chancellor had told him that the position had been offered to Milam, and that the board had had a difficult decision to make, that they had decided that if Milam turned it down, that it was to be offered to Fontera. So it wasn't that they had, you know, turned him down, or had been negative on him. And Fontera said the chancellor had been very nice about it, and that he did say that he told the chancellor that he thought the search committee could have done an excellent job for any university in the country. He was very impressed by the committee, the committee's operation. In fact, he said he thought the amenities had fallen off a little bit after the chancellor's office had taken over! In that, you know, they didn't provide, you know, for any—nobody, you know, met them at the airport and so on, you know, when they came in, and you know, and that type of thing. He said plus, that dinner thing which came off, you know, actually much better than expected, but which could have been kind of a disastrous type of experience. But he, you know, overall, he wanted me to thank the committee for all their hospitality and friendship. And he would always remember, you know, how nicely they were treated.

So any rate, I knew there on that Sunday afternoon— well, I called just one person on the committee and that was Pat Fladager, that night, because she had been so anxious and I had told her I'd let her know as soon as I knew. Of course, I hadn't heard it through official channels but I called her and asked her not to say anything, because from what Fontera had said, as I thought about it, I wasn't sure whether Milam had accepted or not. And then

when I, you know, read in the paper Sunday morning that the announcement wasn't going to be made until Monday and then I think the next day, next morning the announcement was to be made Tuesday.

And right away when I saw that Sunday morning I said, "Well, it's not Fontera. Because he would have accepted right away." You know, with no question. So then it was down to Milam or Gerth. Well, then I thought it sounded like maybe Milam was still making up his mind. And so I told Pat not to say anything because, you know, if it came out it was Milam and then he had turned it down and offered it to Fontera, it wouldn't look good. So she still had her hopes up that if it was—you know, it was Fontera.

So then the next day, Monday, I just went around, you know. I was at school and I met my classes in the morning. Then in the afternoon—early in the afternoon—I decided to drop by Ed Olsen's office, public information officer. And I asked Ed if anything had, you know, if any candidate had been accepted. And he said, "Well I can't, you know, say anything."

And so then I said, "Well, I know who was offered the position."

And he said, "Well, come into the office." So we went into the office and then talked about it. And he said that Milan had asked for time to notify some people, the Rockefellers and some of the others, before it was actually made public. And that they were going to make it public at, they had decided, five o'clock, Monday. And so he had the story, you know, all ready to go and everything.

So then I went over to see Sally Kees, and also went up to mention to Agnes Heidtman, who had worked so well with us through this whole process, as the secretary. And I had told her I would let her know and since it was just a couple hours by this time before the deadline

why, I let her know. And then called a couple other faculty members that I was able to get hold of, including Bob Tompson, who was overjoyed to hear about it. And of course, Mary Ellen was out of town so I wasn't able to contact her. And so then by the time I went to the dinner which the Center for Religion and Life was having that evening—this was on May 6th— why, this was all the talk of the people there, about the selection of the president.

I might just mention too, in terms of what I think might develop as far as Dr. Milam's administration as president. I think all members of the committee were struck by the brilliant mind he has. We also know that he's been an excellent administrator in the state of Arkansas. He does lack the higher administrative experience in education itself, but I don't think that this will be a problem for him. I think that during the first year of his administration, he will probably make comparatively few changes, especially personnel-wise. But that he will be finding out how the thing works and finding out where the strengths are as far as the administrative personnel, and so on. And perhaps some weaknesses, too. And by the second year, there probably will be some changes. But I expect that he will want to do much more in budgetary matters and so on, than the two previous presidents, Miller and Armstrong did—although they certainly worked with a budget and this was an important aspect of their administration. Milam has had this experience being the chief fiscal officer for the state of Arkansas, and I think he will be on top of the budget.

I'm not sure whether he will want to bring an administrative assistant or not. Some of the other candidates had thought—they were amazed that there wasn't an assistant to the president. And also in the same connection,

that there was really no budget officer or institutional studies officer on campus, that we relied completely on the chancellor's office, you know, for those types of studies and so on.

I think this had been brought out to Milam, too, while he was here. At least most of the members, if not all members, of the committee felt that our campus had not really been treated fairly in terms of budget allocations and so on within the system, and that we needed a strong spokesman and one who would get the facts and present them in an effective way. And I think he will be very good in this way, in terms of working with the chancellor and also the chancellor's cabinet, having done his homework and being prepared. He told me that he was—I think I may have mentioned this earlier too—that since his graduate days he had been a seventy-hour a week man. In other words, in terms of how much time he put in. And that he reads voraciously. I think he will be, you know, thoroughly up on matters which are of importance to the University. And he's very widely read in various areas of academic life.

Perhaps, too, I might mention as far as suggestions for the future committees, that the Board of Regents has asked us to come up with some suggestions and I am getting these from various members of the committee. And I think one of the recommendations which the committee will make to the regents is that more money be made available the next time around for the presidential search. It was five thousand dollars. I think if this were doubled, it would be worth it, in terms of the amount of money involved because this is such an important decision.

You could bring spouses in.

Right. They would know earlier along. We had to

decide whether to bring in more candidates, or to bring the spouses and say, half as many candidates. As it turned out, given the resources we had, it was better that we brought in nine in terms of the number that were eventually involved in being nominated. But it would have been better, you know, if we'd been able to bring the spouses in at the time of the interview. Also, I think it would have been better if we had been able to send two committee members to visit the campuses of the other candidates because we relied very heavily on one person's impressions and judgment in deciding who we invite to the campus. Although as it turned out we invited most, you know, or something like three fourths of the ones that we had actually visited on the campuses.

But I think it would be better, you know, and I don't think that with the amount of money that, you know, was involved, that that should stand in the way of doing these other things. And so perhaps that will be something that might be taken up by the board later.

In terms of other aspects of the procedures followed by the committee, I think most committee members felt that the rating system that we worked out and so on worked fairly well. There were some, Bob McKee for instance, who felt that we should have used a system which he believed had some merit. And that is where, originally, you have ratings of the committee. Then, as you get more and more information (I guess maybe it'd be each time you receive a reference letter), you re-rate them and so on. And, discuss them again each time. It would have been much more time-consuming, but supposedly this system works in such a way that eventually you come to have a consensus on the committee. I'm not sure with some of the candidates that that would have been possible, you know, for the committee to really all agree on just what

rating an individual should have been given. But if you had more time, that would have been a possibility.

But as a whole, I was really surprised myself that a committee that large and as diversified in terms of the interests that were represented got along as well as it did. I thought the committee as a whole worked well together. And there were very few times when there were really any problems, in terms of, you know, open clashes as far as the committee members. And even on this matter of the chancellor—whether the candidates should visit with the chancellor when they came to the campus—it was a situation where the real difference came at different meetings. And in the meeting, specifically in which I was absent, they pretty well agreed to go the other way and restrict the candidates from visiting with the chancellor. And then when I came back and explained my side of the story and what I'd already informed the candidates, you know, that they would be able to visit with the chancellor, then practically everybody agreed that would be best. And so there, you know, weren't really any strong clashes. There were some situations, as I mentioned previously, where Bob McKee kind of disagreed with the majority in terms of approaches to be used from time to time. But really, the committee worked, I thought, you know, well together. And I felt they were very supportive.

The students didn't feel at all intimidated by working equally with faculty people and deans and so forth?

No, I didn't feel this. Now, originally, first, I felt that they were, you know, kind of holding back in terms of, you know, full participation. But when it came down to, you know, this final group of twenty-nine or so, they spoke out,

you know, and there was no question where they felt. And so I felt that overall, especially in the last, you know, few weeks, everybody was speaking out and yet it wasn't a situation where people were jumping down people's necks, you know, for saying one thing or another.

In connection with the suggestions, you know, as far as improvement. Fontera mentioned to me over the phone that when Neil Humphrey had asked him about what he thought about the procedures and so on, he said that he would suggest that there be members of the Board of Regents on the next search committee. And I think once more perhaps what he was thinking, that they (the committee and the board) might be more of one mind than in terms of the selection, if this were true. At Southeastern Massachusetts, when they searched for their president a couple years ago—I guess it was three or four years ago—they had four students, four faculty members, and four members of their board of trustees. And so they, you know, worked together in that way.

They got to know each other as individuals.

Right. And so then, when they just decided on one candidate, then that was it. I mean it was pro forma as far as the board accepting, because they had had these four members, you know, on the committee. So they were in on it, you know, through this whole process. The question I would have about board members serving on the committee (and this is something I mentioned to the board as well), was whether we would have board members who would be able to spend the time. Now, maybe they would just be able to get in on a portion of the meetings which might cause some problems, too.

But, you know, there the last few weeks, you know, I would say the average member was spending, you know, twenty hours a week either going over papers or attending meetings and so on. I think I was spending more than that. But it was really a time-consuming job. So that would be perhaps one drawback. But there are some advantages, certainly. I think one of the advantages is the point that Terry Reynolds mentioned to me when he suggested, you know, that a regent be on the board and the fact that the regents would be able to understand perhaps the thinking of the committee a little better there, than other members of the board.

PUBLIC OCCASIONS BOARD

MARTIN DICKSTEIN, CHAIRMAN

Martin Dickstein: I'm Martin Dickstein and I'm currently chairman of the Public Occasions Board for the University of Nevada, Reno campus. This is my sixth year as chairman; I might be breaking some kind of record, I don't know [laughing]. I was asked to be chairman by President Miller in October of 1968. I've been on the board, I would say, about ten years; it's been almost too long for me to remember exactly. In every year before being chairman, I was the committee of one to select the performers that the Public Occasions Board has had the pleasure to bring to the campus. The chairmen before me were Dr. Charlton Laird of the English Department, now retired; Kenneth Carpenter of the Library; James Hulse of the History Department.

I'd like to start off with a statement that I wrote for the annual brochure that we designed and had printed and sent out to the campus. We have a mailing list of about 1500 and we also distribute—well, we have about 3,000 or 4,000, I think, printed—and we distribute them to schools and libraries and

various places around town who can contact people who are interested in concerts that we give. And this is a quote from the brochure:

The Public Occasions Board of the University of Nevada, Reno, was formed in 1962 to bring notable professional musicians and lecturers to the campus for the appreciation of the University and town community. It is financed by University funds and ticket sales.

Now, I think, before I describe what the Public Occasions Board has done and is doing, I'd like to say a few words about what it *doesn't* do, because the name is slightly misleading. "Public Occasions Board" is very general and it seems to be all-inclusive, but there are many other events on campus with which we have no connection. To give some examples, the Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Reno, bring lecturers and rock and folk concerts; they pay for that out of their own funds. There are several film

series, foreign film series, classic film series—we don't have anything to do with that. Music Department gives concerts. Of course, the whole area of sports events, which we just don't try to—well, we don't have anything to do with them; they're far too numerous.

But one thing that we *do* do to assist people who are giving their own events of any kind on campus, is to—when they ask us—advise them of the problems, the complications, and necessities of putting on an event on campus. For instance, scheduling for a place to put it, for a place to hold their event, whether it's in the theater or the gymnasium. There aren't terribly many places on campus and that's why it's difficult to get one when you need it. And you have to reserve these places a long time in advance. And when we put on our five Concerts, we have to reserve the Fine Arts Theater over a year ahead, because of conflicts with Music Department's concerts and the plays that the Drama Department puts on.

We advise them about selling tickets, and any kind of technical requirements that their event might need, such as lighting, musical instruments, sound equipment. We know pretty much what equipment we have on campus (which isn't very professional). We've had to go, on several occasions, into Sacramento to get some special sound equipment for some of our concerts. And we also try to advise anybody who comes to us how to avoid conflicts. And we do that by—well, there is a master calendar, which I will get to, which is not exactly one of the Public Occasions Board's products, but it's done by a very important member of the Public Occasions Board; in fact, the only one who is a continuous member. And that's Patricia Thomas over in the Student Union.

In the past also, departments who had no money or very little money have been sent to us by President Miller and sometimes by

other people on campus, to see if we could cosponsor or help them out on something. Like the English Department, Summer Session Director, Foreign Languages Department, and sometimes we've been able to help them and have gotten some very good things together. But other times, we didn't have the money either. And so really, the board is quite limited.

Now, after having told you what we *don't* do, I'd really like to tell you something about what we *do* do. Within the limits of our budget and within the restrictions of the facilities on campus, to put on any kind of performing arts event, we do the best we can to bring the highest quality, at the most economic prices, of concerts and lectures, to the campus. We feel that the performing arts, especially the less commercial types, like chamber music, have a very important place on campus, a rightful place. We have a philosophy that the performing arts are a vital part of the education and cultural life of the students, the faculty, and staff. And they're also an important and well-appreciated contribution to community culture. I certainly have been dedicated to this cause, and I believe we have a very good board this year and they are dedicated to it, too.

The members of the board do give quite a bit of time, very generously, to the board (let's see, how can I say this?) because it's the nature of the University boards to do this as [an] extracurricular activity, part of your professional requirements and participation in running and managing and contributing to the University. However, the Public Occasions Board is different from any other board on campus; I'm almost tempted to use the word *unique*. And the reason for that is, boards are policy making and advisory to other departments who function, who do the work. To give you an example, I don't have the correct names, but parking and

traffic—they function to advise and make policy and help the police department. The radio and television board makes policy and advises and considers problems for the Audio-Visual Department. And so it goes. And I think the Public Occasions Board is the only one that doesn't advise anybody. It functions as a department of the campus, but organized as if it were a board. In other words, we have our own budget. I really don't know if any other board has a budget; there may be one or two, I'm not so sure. But we do get a budget. I have to request it and defend it as often as it's required, every year, every two years, sometimes [for] long range plans, every four years. Then after we get funding (which is usually far less than we asked for in our budget request), we make our own policy and we spend the money and we put on our own programs. And we really don't advise anybody. We produce the program, we settle all the technical details, we have to do our own publicity. And there's a lot of printing of materials to be done—the brochures, tickets, programs, posters—and we have to design all of these and proofread them and have them printed over at the Central Services, and we pay for them out of the Public Occasions Board's budget. So it does function, you see, as a University department rather than a University board.

When the board is notified of the amount of funding of money again, we meet and one of the most—the most important thing is to appoint a selection committee, in order to spend that money. And they will meet on their own during the year and finally come up with a recommendation for a program for the following year. It's not an easy thing to do, because when you select your concerts or lectures and you get your contracts, you're doing this a year in advance of your funding. And then if your funding is cut, you run the risk of being in the red.

We've solved that by sending all contracts to Chancellor Neil Humphrey. And he signs them, knowing full well that if we didn't have enough money to pay for that contract, he's underwriting it, because his name's on it and not mine [laughing]. Which is a very fortunate—.

Now, that's one source of money, the state appropriated money. I would like to say at this time that President Miller has been one of our best supporters in the years that he was here. He really was interested in the work of the board and the artistic events that were brought to campus.

Another source of money is ticket sales. We try to charge the absolute minimum. For instance, this year—and it just went up from last year—it was five dollars for a long time for the whole season. This year it went up to seven dollars for five Concerts for non-students and three for the whole season for students. Now, of course, that's pretty cheap, because in any large city, for concerts of much, I would say, less importance than the ones we bring, you pay that or more for any one concert. Like San Francisco or New York—some place like that.

Well, part of the policy of the board in selecting the occasions—the performers to bring, the events to put on—is that we do not want to duplicate anything else that's brought into town or on campus. Not only do we not want to duplicate it, we almost can't, because the kind of thing students bring is very, very expensive. For one rock concert, they can spend twice as much as I have budgeted for my whole year. They have spent as much as \$10,000 on a musical—play production of a Broadway musical. And yet, my whole current year's budget is \$4,000. Now, you might wonder how I can get five concerts together for \$4,000? Well, it's hard [laughing]. But you have to work very closely with the agents, and over a period of years we've gotten to

know them very well. We're fortunate in that performers enjoy coming to Reno; if they have never been here, they like to come for the first time. And if they've been here once, they all seem to want to come again.

And by being where we are geographically, we frequently catch these groups between their really big concerts. So if they're traveling from Salt Lake City to San Francisco and it takes them two nights, they don't mind; in fact, they enjoy coming to us at less than cost. Not only to see Reno, but in order to play another concert and keep alert and warmed up. Because on a concert tour, you might be traveling three months and might be giving something like 150, or I don't know how many concerts. And you get very tired. And these performers do have to keep in practice. They certainly can't rehearse in hotel rooms, and giving a concert is one of the greatest ways that they can keep up, and enjoy themselves at the same time. So we're very lucky to get really big names in the concert world.

We're also limited by the production facilities of the campus. In other words, the lack of them. There isn't much room and there isn't much equipment to do anything fancy. And the only place that's really suitable is the Church Fine Arts Theater. Now, it only holds 270 people. Of course, it has a nice stage and it's comfortable. But you cannot ask, even if you could afford—you cannot ask a very, very well known musician—for instance, a Van Cliburn—to come to a theater and play before 270 people when he can play before 4,000 people wherever he goes. And that's very important. Even if we paid him his fee, which is, I think, about \$8,000 now for one concert, he would not come. And there are many like that. You couldn't get Artur Schnabel, you couldn't get Isaac Stern. Also, we can't get dance companies, we can't get drama—

the production is just more than we can accomplish. We have, a couple of times, used the Pioneer Theater Auditorium. The overhead is so great that we cannot afford it. It cost, I think, between \$350 and \$500 just for the lighting and the security guards, and then whatever the Pioneer Theater needs in the way of their fee. We can't afford that in addition to the fee of the artists. And besides that, the Pioneer Theater is just the other—it goes to the other extreme. It has 1200 seats and we couldn't come anywhere near filling it up, so that would be ridiculous, also.

And so the kind of thing we bring is generally chamber music and soloists, pianists. We have brought singers, but for some reason or other, singers' prices are higher than any other type of performer. So we bring duos—violin and piano, and cello and piano—and trios and quartets and quintets and amazingly enough, even small chamber orchestras, because we can still afford that kind of thing. That is what I mean when I say that we don't duplicate what everybody else brings.

Community Concerts has a series, but they don't really take a chance on chamber music, because they *do* have to fill up the Pioneer Theater Auditorium and they do have to cover their expenses, and they're not funded by the state, and so they're afraid they won't sell that many tickets because people aren't interested in chamber music as much as they are in the more popular types of music. And we feel that we're not restricted by having to be commercial, so we can bring the best kind of cultural event without worrying about making money. And without other resources in Reno for classical music—well, there are, I shouldn't say that, there are quite a few, but—chamber music is pretty rare.

Ruth G. Hilts: You have a select audience, I should think.

The audiences have grown some over the years, but it is small. We haven't sold Out very often, only on a few occasions. One of the things that amazes me the most was that we did have a sold Out theater for Igor Kipnis, a harpsichordist, who I thought would be [laughing] one of the least of the drawing attractions of all our performers. That was a very interesting development. So we specialize in chamber music of the highest quality.

And very briefly, I wanted to go back over the previous years to mention a few of the names of the important people. In 1962-63 we had Hal Holbrook in "Mark Twain Tonight." I think that was the highlight of that season. In '63-'64 we had the Quintetto Boccherini. In '64-'65 we had Deller Consort from England. We had Christine Walevska, who wasn't well known then. She was a very young girl, in her early '20's, beautiful girl, played a marvelous cello, and currently is very successful playing all over Europe and recording for very big companies like Deutsche Gramophone Records. And so it's very interesting to us to have gotten a person early in their career, and then have them become really famous.

We also had a touring company of "In White America," a play which in the '64-'65 season, was very popular, not really a play, a sort of documentary. It was well known at the time. And we had Nemenoff and Luboshutz, duo pianists. In '65-'66 we had the Amadeus Quartet, in my opinion one of the greatest quartets in the world. They're from England. We had [Nicanor] Zabaleta, undoubtedly the greatest harpist in the whole world. In '66-'67 we had Beveridge Webster, very, very fine pianist; the Lenox String Quartet, which since then have become more popular than it was then, records for all the big record companies. [In] '67-'68, we had Igor Kipnis; he's probably the most prominent

harpsichordist in the western world. And '68-'69, the Concentus Musicus, a wonderful group from Germany who played baroque music on early instruments. Now, I'm only quoting one out of a season of four, five or six concerts. I think they're so outstanding that I'd just like to mention them.

One very—I guess it was exciting, but to me it was very depressing and unpleasant—thing happened in 1972-73. The Israeli Trio came. We had contracted for them the year before, but before they came, the Arab-Israeli problems began. And there had been some shootings in other countries in Europe (I think there was one in Belgium) because of this problem. At the same time during this season, the Israel Philharmonic played in New York and there was a great deal of trouble with demonstrations and police guards and everything. Well, we received a letter from the Israeli State Department, telling us that they had to be protected and that their hotel had to be kept a secret. And they would like non-uniformed, plain dressed police wherever they went. And this was quite a hassle, because they had to be put up at a hotel, brought here for rehearsal, brought back to the hotel for dinner, back for the concert, and then we were planning a reception—a private reception at somebody's house. And so we had to, with the help of the campus police department and the Reno police department, we had to have plain clothesmen with them at all times. And they did—they did carry guns. And I personally thought it was sad.

Was there any real reason for that in this community?

No, no, but we were instructed to do so by the Israeli State Department and it did come through the United States government somewhere along the line. And I did go to

President Miller, at the time, asking if all this was necessary. And he thought we should comply. And so we did—he agreed and then we had all this done.

That same year, we had the Borodin String Quartet, very fine string quartet from Russia. This past season (we had our last concert on April 25th), I thought was a very fine season. We had the New York Brass Quintet. The final concert was the Early Music Consort of London. And this was their first American tour. They played early instruments, and did the background music for the very fine BBC productions last year of “Elizabeth I” and “The Six Wives of Henry the VIII,” and I think one other. And well, all the music to the shows that we saw on television was performed by the Early Music Consort of London. So you can see that it’s been very exciting, for me, to have personally met all these people. And our audiences, I think, are *very* appreciative, and over the years we have given many receptions for these people. Especially the ones from foreign countries have the chance to see homes of the people here and enjoy themselves and relax.

Are they community music patrons who entertain? Or are they faculty people as a rule?

Some are faculty and some are community. And they’re all volunteers and they always do it at their own expense. And really, they do it for their own pleasure, actually, because they want to meet these musicians. So it’s been a very, very interesting experience for me.

I’m sure the most important person, who has really made this board, enabled this board to do—you saw in funding what it has done—is Patricia Thomas over in the Student Union. She is Special Activities Assistant by title. And she does the University Calendar and a number of things for the Student Union. But

she is a continuing, and full voting member of the board, and her experience since 1965 on that board, her expertise and her energy has really held everything together. Actually, her job is more “show biz” than anything else. She really can conquer all the problems—sometimes seemingly insurmountable—of scheduling, of equipment needed, of moving pianos and harpsichords, of tuning, of getting ushers, of getting the programs out in time, lighting. At one time we had a concert where somebody needed electronic equipment and had to get all that arranged. She’s just a marvel of efficiency, and, well, knowledgability in getting these things to come together on one night and happen.

Other members of the board this year—of course, they change, but since I have this opportunity, I’d just like to list them. We have Roscoe Booth of the Music Department; Robert Diamond, English; William Halberstadt, Philosophy Department; William Welch, professor of biochemistry; Carole Olsen, from Audio-Visual—she’s been especially generous with her art work for all our programs; Neal Ferguson, History; Wayne Martin, curriculum specialist in Education; Edward Martinez, Art Department; and Jack Ritenhouse from the Library.

We have had students assigned to the board during various years. I must say that there was no contribution at all. And from ASUN, although they were requested to, they did not appoint a student this year. And GSA, the Graduate Students Association, did appoint a student too late for any of our meetings [laughing]. So they never did anything.

I would like to put in a plug, by the way, for a number of other cultural activities on and off the campus which the University faculty and staff contribute to. First of all, there’s the University Arts Festival. That’s been going

on for about seven years. I was treasurer for the first four years. That's come to be quite a successful, enjoyable annual event. And they're funded by the Nevada State Council on the Arts, as are some of these others in part. The Nevada Opera Guild was [an] extremely difficult kind of thing to get together in small city like Reno. And Ted Puffer, chairman of the Music Department practically single-handedly did all the work in accomplishing this. The University Community symphony Orchestra is a good example of the joint participation of townspeople and University people. Community Concerts has had on its board of directors University faculty, including myself. The Reno Little Theater is a very good example. A really large number of University faculty perform in their plays and the current chairman of the board and supervising director is David Hettich of the English Department. Young Audiences of Reno has many University faculty participants. For most of these organizations, Merle Snider, the president of the Reno musicians union, has been a very important motivating—well, has been a great help because of the money he was able to provide from the Nevada Council on the Arts, which in turn get an allocation from the National Endowment for the Arts. So you see, there's really a lot going on in Reno, and there's always room for more, because the performing arts are cumulative, and I think the more we see them and the more types you get to enjoy, the more you want to see them. They never compete, they never displace, they're just one of the finest things that a University and a town can get together to offer.

The foregoing statement, sort of an answer to your suggestion about discussing our strong cultural influence on the local community and a dialogue existing between the two, I think all of these organizations demonstrate that very well.

One of the big problems of the board, I think, since its very inception has been to attract the student, or to be more of an attraction to the students. But we find the students to be strangely diffident; probably not strange, because for many of them it's their first exposure to chamber music, lectures, and classical films, concerts, and all these things. And it's something that it would be better if you had had the opportunity to grow up with. However, many students do show up. And we'd like to reach many more. When people say it's a matter of publicity, this is absolutely no helpful suggestion whatsoever, because all we can do is get our announcements in the *Sagebrush* and the *Staff Newsletter* and the local newspapers and we even have them on radio and TV. But when people don't recognize something that they think they might be interested in, even if they hear it or read it in the newspaper, it's just like not having seen it at all.

We'd like to appeal to the general student. That's the whole point. I don't know how we can ever really accomplish that. But I think that whoever we do reach, we appreciate it at least that much. I have the feeling that our concerts and lecturers have a place on campus as part of the cultural atmosphere, just like classes in any subject. It's not compulsory for every student to attend every class on campus, nor is it compulsory to attend these concerts. But they (the concerts) should be there as part of their education. And whoever can be coaxed or persuaded to come and enjoy these things, I think, will benefit from this experience and it gives us great pleasure to have been able to do that. And I think that the rules of commercial success just don't apply to us at all. As long as the president and chancellor and the Board of Regents can find their way to fund us, we will go on trying to bring these things for everybody to enjoy.

SAGEBRUSH
KELSIE HARDER, EDITOR

Kelsie Harder: I'm Kelsie Harder—the outgoing editor of the University of Nevada *Sagebrush*. Last year, Buddy Frank called me on the phone and asked if I would run for editor of the *Sagebrush*, which I thought was pretty funny. Because I didn't care about going back to school [a requirement for editor]. He told me the paper was in a state of disarray and sort of collapse. He'd seen my work habits and asked me if I'd run for the office. I sort of took it as a joke, and I said, "No thanks."

And so I thought about it a day, and I got to looking at the University paper. I had some familiarity with the news business. I worked at a local TV station for a year, in the news department in their film history section, and edited the six-thirty and eleven o'clock news reports. And I'd worked for the *Philadelphia Bulletin* for two years. I had some ideas at the time, but [they] weren't really possible to put into effect because everything was so established at those news operations. I called him back up and said, "You know, I've been thinking it over and maybe it's not a bad idea."

He presented me with the things that I would have to do. Playing politics in student government isn't unlike playing politics with any other—what d'you call— more "sophisticated" organization. So he told me [in order] to get elected what I'd have to do is go over and talk with the incoming publications board. You sit there and you'd listen to what their ideas were for a student publication and you'd nod, even if it was not agreeable with your philosophy. I couldn't do that. That upset Buddy a great deal. I said if I did such a thing, I'd have an obligation to each of those people even before I got started with the job, and I would like to start the job fresh. So Buddy got mad and hung the phone up [laughing]. That's the way it's done.

It's not "totally" unethical; it's just a matter you're sort of building up a *following* to get elected, and I've seen a lot of politicians in Nevada follow the same process. Then, once you get in, you just turn around and do what you want to do anyway. I didn't want to take it from that strategy.

So when I went into the pub[lication] board to present my case for the office, I wouldn't say it was exactly a friendly board because I prepared for a couple of days for it. I had five pages of notes, my ideas were outlined, philosophy of putting a newspaper together, and what I'd like to do. And I walked into the board meeting, and the student advisor was the person who had fired me from a job [laughs] a year earlier. So I thought—I "really" thought I had a stacked deck.

But I went ahead and presented my case. [Then] the board asked a sum total of five questions, all very brief, all very nondescript, and I assumed the job wasn't mine, because the other three or four people presented lengthy presentations. Two hours and forty-five minutes later, after everyone had given their presentations, they [pub board] called and said that I'd been elected, which surprised me.

From that point, after the election, I went to work at the old *Sagebrush* office which was, as Buddy described it: "in a state of ill-repair." And it *was*—it was an absolute mess. There was no photo file. All the photographs were put in cardboard boxes. Nothing was labeled. There was one file folder; it said, "*Sagebrush* 64-65." There [were] no background file folders on any subject matter whatsoever. It was just—they'd start out fresh—this has been the problem.

I was appalled, anyway, I went into the office and I looked around and saw what was going on. It looked like a garbage pile. All the back issues of the *Sagebrush*, the old issues from the '20's and the '30's were all thrown in a corner. There was litter on top of 'em, and empty soft drink cans, tissue papers. It was garbage. I don't know if you're familiar with the old building that the *Sagebrush* was located in, the basement [of Stewart Hall]. The walls were falling apart, all the typewriters

were broken. I was hard-pressed to figure out how they put out a newspaper.

So, I went to work for about, anywhere from five to eight hours a day, [summer] and I requisitioned some file folders. By the end of the year I'd requisitioned 4,000. I built up a photo file in excess of about 400 subjects of personalities on campus, and state and national. We built—I'd say, in excess of 3,500 file folders on subject matters. First of all, I started with campus, and I built it to the local level, regional, state, national, international, with the intention of when students would come down there wanting to research a story, that we would have basically accurate information on file. I went through some former issues of the *Sagebrush*, and I'd find that somebody would go out and write, for example, a story on women's athletics. Well, they would spend maybe five or six hours writing that story, researching it, and then they would get it published, and the following issue there'd have to be a story about the same length, explaining and apologizing for the errors and inaccuracies in the story that had appeared in the previous *Sagebrush*.

With that kind of reporting going in, what was happening was that the *Sagebrush* had leaned heavily on reprints of national news, or student handout news, or news syndications for, you know, accurate information. I thought the best way—we'd just start right from rock bottom.

Everybody kept walking in and they'd say, "you can't do this" and "you can't do that" because "it's not with tradition." And I just said, "Bull[?]. The *Sagebrush* doesn't have any tradition; it's a joke as it stands now." I was looking at it with a jaundiced eye. I said, "If this paper which only pacifies me before the fifty people in the ASUN building—" And with that kind of budget, for too few people being covered in the *Sagebrush*, I figured

it'd be a smarter idea to take the money and break it into forty-two one thousand dollar scholarships and give it to students to study, if it's going to be that much a waste of finances.

So, I just started right from the bottom and started building what my idea of good research would be. Also we had a plus factor because Terry Reynolds [ASUN President] saw what I was trying to do working all that time for free. I wasn't on work-study, and I was doing it out of my time when I could have been doing something else and being paid.

He started a crash program to get the *Sagebrush* moved into the basement of Morrill Hall. That was [an] interesting thing that happened there, because I walked over to the basement of Morrill Hall—I had an appointment with Terry there—so I went to the basement of

Morrill Hall and here's five to eight people standing around, bickering about where they wanted this, and how should this be done (the rearrangement of the structure of the physical format of the basement to make it satisfactory for use as a student office for a newspaper).

So I walked in, and Terry spun around and says, "Well, here's the editor. Maybe you should ask him." Here's these people standing around from Buildings and Grounds. I had worked the summer before on a project with a carpenter friend restoring the old McCarran mansion. We'd been tearing out walls and putting in new doors and building new hallways, and so forth. And so they said, "Well, if you're going to be working here next year, how would you like to see the physical layout of this place?" Anybody who's been over to the basement of Morrill Hall—the floors were rotted out and the walls were caving in and everything was busted up.

I started looking around and it looked like a hopeless situation. First of all, I'd tear up this floor and pour cement in here, and go

right down to the brick here on the walls, and I'd lower the ceilings so we could get a little more heat in here. And I'd have an open access hallway here so you could move more freely from this area to that area, and I'd tear out that wall, and those book shelves over there, and put in a dark room. And perhaps we could use that back office there for files and books.

And so, the fellow who was in charge of Buildings and Grounds and the physical layout of the basement, he just looked at me—"Gee, I wish everybody was as easy to work with." And I was astounded because I walked right in off the street; Terry turned and looked at me and said, "Here, what do you think? You know, you'll be using it as a room, how would you like to see the layout?" And in a matter of five minutes [planning] they were going to do everything, including paint it the color that I thought would be a good idea for lighting in there, and the fluorescent lights, and everything.

So I walked in there at the beginning of the school year, and there it was, exactly the way in five minutes time I described it—you know—as I would like to see the room set up. I was floored. So we have new offices. It's a perfect place for a student newspaper.

I know in time, the faculty lounge, which they project, or would like to put in the basement of Morrill Hall—once it's restored, they will "obviously" try to usurp the *Sagebrush* [office] and move it to another less desirable location. I can see the handwriting's on the wall, but it would be a tragedy to move the location of a student newspaper once it does get established in what I think is the most beautiful building on campus to another area, because they talk about tradition on this campus, and "tradition" on this campus has always been putting the student newspaper in the location that nobody wants. And they've done it year after year, and last year was a case

in point. They wanted to move the student newspaper out of the basement of one run-down building into the basement of another run-down building, and then when they make it known that they want to restore Morrill Hall and they'll fix it up to a desirable location for other people, they'll probably try to move the student newspaper out again. It's a mistake.

The thing is, they talk about tradition. What we've done this year with the paper, which has never been done before, we're making a real effort for continuity. In the five or so years that I've been around people who have managed and worked with the *Sagebrush*, at the end of every year they said, "Good. I'm going, I'm leaving, and I'm getting the hell out of here—let the next guy worry about it." That's a bad philosophy, because, a university newspaper offers something a journalism department won't offer and a downtown paper won't offer. If you want computerized people, then you can send them over to the Journalism Department. They come out of there terrified. No matter how liberal a student likes to think they are, they'll come down and they'll be working on the *Sagebrush*, and I'll be breaking what they consider to be a journalistic taboo. It's just like the fellow that runs the 100-yard dash in nine-five and they say, well, no one's going to be running the 100-yard dash in nine-four. He can't do it because it's the record. The record's now nine [flat]; I don't know what it was at the turn of the century, eleven flat, or something.

There are a lot of things to consider here. There's a possibility—. You see, I'm stretching, sort of, my philosophy of the way I look at life over into, say, a student newspaper, which I don't think's a negative thing. What I'm saying is that if a student comes to me and they have a story, rather than berate them or browbeat them, and say, "No, you can't write this way," or, "You've asked the wrong questions," or,

"You've gone about it the wrong way," we just sit down and talk about it. I try to keep as much of their style—this can really wear thin after a while.

I have a couple of writers this year. [One is] working on a Ph.D. in English and he would come in with his sports stories that he'd taken fifteen, twenty minutes to write, and to show you the lengths that I would go to, I'd spend maybe a half an hour, forty-five minutes rewriting that one story to make it acceptable for publication.

Ruth G. Hilts: You'd rewrite it? You didn't tell him he had to?

No. Well, because, "see," he was Ph.D. candidate and he was teaching a couple classes and he compared him—self to Norman Mailer and tragically—luckily for Norman—it [style] wasn't. But this is just one example. I had situations like this happen time and time again. But we had another writer come down there with maybe fifteen pages of copy, repetitious type material. And not that I like copy so clean-cut that it goes right to the marrow—I like the adjectives, I like the person's personal point of view in an article. And this is another thing that's made the *Sagebrush* more readable this year is that once you've finished with one article, the style passes and you go into another article with a "new style." And that "can" keep people's interest.

There's a lot of things here I want to be saying and I'm not sure that I'm getting to them. When I talk about my personal philosophy—what I'm saying is, that ever since I've lived in Nevada I've met a lot of creative people. I have found a few places where there are acceptable outlets for that creativity. I know and appreciate the frustrations of the "straight" people dealing

with “creative” people, but my attitude is that if you can harness some of that creativity into an “acceptable” form of communication, you’re going to come up with a much better product. It can be terribly frustrating because the people in the community, particularly around Nevada, aren’t always prepared to accept that deviation. But that deviation, however slight (a person who is tremendously creative can be a real liability to a product) but if you handle them with kid gloves and give them a chance to express themselves and go easy on them, and still, at the same time, maintain some sort of decorum about your communication, you’re going to come out with a good product.

I had a couple of kids who came out this year to the newspaper and they were so *stoned out*. And so, rather than take a hard-line attitude and say, “You’re fired, get lost. I don’t want to see you again,” and this is too frustrating because now I’m going to have to have a couple of extra hours of work to do, I say, “Go home, sleep it off—see you next paper.” These things happen. People don’t want to talk about them, but anybody that’s around college life, you know—people get a little worked up over things. But see, this year the difficulty and the stress on me is—if you look at the masthead and you go down that list of names, you realize that I’m having to deal with “all” these people. And I would say in the total of the nine months that I worked on the paper, I lost my temper four times, and I can recall all of them quite vividly. But they came at pretty essential points to lose one’s temper. It’s hard; ‘cause if you lose your temper at everybody that has let you down—I’m talking about creative people—you lose them. They don’t come back and work because they’re temperamental enough that if you say, “Look you’re doing a rotten job. Get lost,” [they] won’t come back. So we have to say, “Look, I realize you’ve got

a problem. Things aren’t working Out. Why don’t you come back the next time? Go home, sleep it off, take it easy, go out, relax, take in a movie.”

Do you characterize your staff, then, as a group of creative people? You didn’t have any run-of-the-mill student-reporter types?

The University has gotten [a] lot of top level, high caliber people for a bargain. I don’t toss the word *genius* around very lightly, but—Hank Nuwer, when it comes to writing, has got to fall into that category. Larry Winkler is one of the best cartoonists I’ve ever met. He gets a little lazy, but he’s—well, that’s what I’m talking about—creative people. I could go right down the whole staff that we printed in the last paper, because in the very last paper we printed, we ran everyone’s name who worked for the *Sagebrush* for any length of time during the year.

Another change in the format this year is: in the past, the people who directed the *Sagebrush*—speaking of the editor—had a tendency to want to do *everything*. Now, there’s some people [who] have very quiet egos and other people have great demanding egos. You see, the first time I walked into the *Sagebrush*, I had ten cartoons, and the *Sagebrush* editor, he looked at my work and says, “Well, we just don’t want any of this type material in our paper and we really don’t care about having people like you on this campus.” Well, I hadn’t even said anything to him. I just showed him the work, and I said, “Well, that’s fine.” He was just sitting there reading his stag magazine with his feet propped up, you know; he was looking at some “cutie.” This was quite a while ago [laughs]; this was twelve years ago. So I turned around and walked out of the office and trudged back on up to the Art Department. (Out of those ten cartoons that

he looked at, one was printed [later] in *Look*, one was printed in the *Saturday Evening Post*, one was printed in the *Evergreen Review* and a couple of the others wound up in journalism and English text books. Now, that was just ten cartoons. See, I've drawn 2,000 cartoons—I have 2,000 cartoons in the library.)

Now, what I'm talking about here specifically is the breakdown of that type of mentality which says, "I've got to do everything myself." Now, obviously, if I've got 2,000 cartoons, one would think that I don't need a cartoonist, right? Well, that's not so, because I want to put my energies into a different section of the paper which was basically—as when I applied for the job and said I wanted to—coordinate a newspaper. Now, people don't listen to me very closely, because usually when I tell 'em that I'm out to do something, unless I find that it is the wrong path taken, I'll adhere to it until the failure comes through.

So I put Larry Winkler to work on the cartoons, Hank Nuwer specially on feature writing, Marlene Olsen on photography, myself basically for doing the layout of the newspaper and trying to work the juxtapositioning of the elements within that newspaper. In other words— a coordinated kind of a project with everyone working on that part which he does best. Now, this year, everyone's always talking about staff meetings this, and assignments sheets this, and so forth. Well, what I did, the second staff meeting that we had—we had a staff meeting at the beginning of the year and we had a staff meeting after, I think, thirty newspapers [later]. Now, that should give somebody an indication right there, that the people who were working on the newspaper knew, if not what I expected of them, at least what they could grow to expect of themselves in relation to the people they were working with.

Now, I saw people starting to taper off on certain works. And people were jockeying for positions because even on a newspaper, people are playing politics. We had the staff meeting, and I said it should be enough for everyone who is working on this paper to realize that the type of people who are working on this paper are doing exactly what they are best at doing. In other words, Dennis Myers, who is a political commentator, isn't doing proofreading, he isn't doing copy correction, he isn't trying to dream up headlines. His main forte is [political] writing. And that's where he works. Consequently, I found myself in a position of pulling the "garbage" chores. I wound up straightening heads, setting headlines, doing copy corrections. But see, even this kind of philosophy can be contagious, because they're saying, "Look, there's Kelsie. He's had about 100 publications to his credit, and what's he doing?" He's proofing copy, he's making corrections. That sort of cuts into their ego and they're going to have to say, "Well, I am not so precious that my only job is really doing cartoons," or "My only job is to write," because after a while they get to looking around, and everybody, after they finish their job, are starting to do what is called the "garbage" chores. They start proofing copy, they start correcting copy.

This year's paper is notorious if at least for one thing, and that is the minimal number of errors in it. I read through, I think it was, five papers in a row and found one misspelled word. That's phenomenal. You can go through the *San Francisco Chronicle* and find fifteen misspelled words in a paragraph sometimes. The headlines—we had three errors in headlines. I went back through every copy—all the time. I'm always recorrecting, and this is sort of the textbook, last year's paper. [Shows bound volume of papers s issues.] I

just went through and bound the whole year's paper in sequence, and I go through every paper and reread it and the blue outlines are for mistakes that the printer made. The red outlines are for mistakes that we made. The printer outnumbers us about ten to one.

Okay, I'll put in a few more words about the staff just so we can kind of go down the list. Of course, Hank Nuwer. Hank Nuwer's a person who's—I don't like to get back in to the old hard-line moralistic—I don't know. I admire Hank Nuwer. [He] is a person who has ethics when it comes to dealing with people, dealing with ideas. He can make creative mistakes, such as in his research, but when you have the burden of 700 pages dropped right in the lap of, maybe, five people, which I projected at the beginning of the year—. I said, "If I can find five people I can work with, this paper will get off the ground." And everybody said, "Well, ha, ha, five people. You know, that should be easy to find in a community of five thousand." Well, that's not true, because there are not people on campus who will sit down and put in the type of work and the time that it takes to put out a good job. You just find 'em. But Hank Nuwer, Pat O'Driscoll, Larry Winkler, Marlene Olsen—these were people that did the work. There are others on the staff, but as I said earlier, I made a deliberate effort to try to free people to do the things that they're best at doing.

Now, I point out when I went to the *Sagebrush* office originally—well, when I was nineteen, I was a little more hard-nosed about some things. For example, that editor that I was referring to previously who did turn down my work for the *Sagebrush*, about a week later picked up a magazine—a national magazine—which had published four pages of my cartoons and an article on it. Well, he called me back to the office, and he said, "You didn't tell me that you've been published in a

national magazine when you brought your work in here."

And I said, "Well, if you don't have enough sense to figure out what's good work without having somebody else to tell you it's good work, then I'm afraid I really don't want to work for the paper." I was being standoffish, but I thought I'd made a point there, maybe, that he should consider, too, in the future.

But for example, when I come across the same kind of situation I'm real—pragmatic. Artists aren't supposed to be "pragmatic." People keep reminding me of that, and I keep reminding them maybe my concept of art and their concept of art doesn't exactly come from the same sources. Everybody likes their stereotypes, and I'm not too fond of 'em. Anyway, I had a couple of writers this year that I will confess that I was less than enamored with, but [didn't] let personal prejudice of that person interfere with having their work in the paper. For example, I had one writer who—he and I were having a bit of a go-around—he stopped turning in columns for three weeks. Well, I intercepted him in a parking lot at a department store here in town, and I walked right up to him and said, "Listen, regardless of what our personal prejudices are against each other, I think the paper is missing something by not having your column in the paper." Well, he was stunned, and the next day in the copy basket I had two stories from him. So he got the point. I'll cite that one example and leave it to everyone else to figure it out. That happened more than once this year.

Well, in the past—I don't know what editors thought that their talents were, but they seemed to think that they could do all the writing, they could do all the photography, they could do all the interviewing. They'd get all the best stories, they'd get all the news breaks and so forth. That's not the role that I conceived.

You're a coordinator?

That's what I told the people at the pub board. I want to coordinate a newspaper. I want to find as much talent in this school as I can get and put it in the paper, and wake this community up to the fact that there are a lot of talented people walking around with no outlet.

I was going to school here at a time when there was a magazine called *Forum* which was the opinion magazine; the *Brushfire* was in flower, which was for poetry and art work; the year book being the established encyclopedia for the senior class, its "traditional" role; and then the student newspaper, which was journalism. But I saw a time when all these publications suffered and fell by the way, and I can trace historically the reason for each one of 'em having bit the dust. Mostly from mismanagement—and those budgets went by-the-bye. And the Sagebrush was the only outlet left. So here you have people moving around campus who have these talents, who aren't being given a place to exhibit them.

My intention was, one, to build the newspaper, to make (I don't like the word *viable*) but to make it a worthwhile format for people to get their ideas in. Anybody who knows me well enough to know what opinions I have, say, on the civil rights, and of the military, and so forth, all they have to do is read Jeff Menicucci's column and I'm about 180 degrees from there, but I ran his column because I thought it should be in the paper.

There's another thing, there's quite a bit of everything in the paper for people. And you "can" have a little bit of everything for people in the paper and not sacrifice quality. As I said earlier—for a period of time, about five years, this paper was really being printed just for the people over in ASUN, which is a continual battle for me, trying to explain to

those people that they are only forty or fifty people out of the 5,000 people student body. And the paper doesn't really exist for their whims and publicity. That's hard to explain to them when they want to protect their status quo. But that's another reason why we put out an index this year, was so if someone wanted to sit down and realize the variation of news information in the paper this year. It's going to surprise a lot of people.

Well, you've tried to make it, then, the voice of the student body. Have the students responded to this? Do they know what they've got?

They started to catch on the second semester. I have been in the presence of past editors when somebody would come in from the agriculture department, and the editor would sit there very concerned, very attentive, and then as soon as the person left the room, he'd just turn around and chuck it in the, what they call the "old Sagebrush" file, which was the garbage, you know, the garbage can. And I thought that was unfair. This year, if you go through the paper—I have taken the time to read every story that's brought in, every story. Now, some stories just aren't—they don't have depth to them. But you check the index and see, well, what is it for agriculture? [Counts] Well, about twenty articles. Well, the School of Agriculture is a big school here. So why ignore 'em? This is a land grant college. Besides that, a lot of research they're doing over there is significant. And so I ran those stories.

And you tried to cover all the colleges?

Right.

I spent six years and eight months in the reserves, so my knowledge of the military is not vast. I had my reasons for doing that. It's called [the] Viet Nam war. There's a

tremendous amount of waste—it's about the only way I can characterize the military—but regardless of my prejudices against the military, even the campus ROTC became familiar with the fact that I would run the news that they brought over. Because to some people it's important, and I can see where certain concepts of national defense and posture are really relevant. But I can also see where there's a vast amount of [waste].

That's what I was talking about earlier, about the *Sagebrush*, if you wanted to draw a correlation between budgets and so forth. I went through a period of time where I was in a barracks where it was nine degrees on the outside and ten degrees on the inside because all the windows were broken. When it came time to move the squadron area, they came in and they rebuilt all the sidewalks, and they put all new doors on the barracks, and they put in all new windows, and all new heating system, and repainted the barracks. We moved out of the squadron area. They tore them [barracks] down. This was because they had so many contracts out, left to the union—the local union—they wanted to get their money in under the previous year's budget, because if they didn't spend that money, then they had to make allowances why they wanted additional funding. And so they go in and they tear everything down and they say, "Look at all the money we spent. We need more money." Well, I call that waste. There's millionaires coming out of the Viet Nam war that shouldn't have been.

In spite of personal prejudices, we [ran] the campus ROTC news. I won't draw a parallel saying that that type of mismanagement's up here. But I think the people that come out of the program here will become all too familiar with that type of waste once they get into it. I'm saying the *Sagebrush* budget last year, and the year before, without qualification,

was wasted. That's why I say, if it's going to be wasted, then somebody should reassess the priorities.

Why don't you go into how you used your money this year to build up a working office?

Okay, well, last year I put out three copies of the *Sagebrush*, and I was paid twenty dollars for doing that. The editor makes sixty-two-fifty a week. Now, when I had the second staff meeting this year, I sat all the students down, and I said, "You've got to look at it this way, this is one of the best paid staffs. It's the most equitably paid staff. Everyone is paid for the job that they do, not for the job that they don't do. The books are open," I said, "That's a claim that I'm afraid editors in the past cannot make." We had a very honest business manager this year, so the records were up and up. They were open to anyone who wanted to sit down and say, "This person's being paid more than me." And if they want to look at the amount of work produced, they wouldn't have an argument, because they'd have to realize that, indeed, the salaries were equitably distributed. I think that is a change for the better, because once you establish that type of precedent, people know that they're going to be paid for the job they do.

Also, the precedent of having the office in Morrill Hall—a pleasant environment to work in, a respectable environment, not a cave. An actual office where people can go in and they can look around and say, "This is a place where I want to sit down and get some work done." There's nothing superfluous about the office. There's open access to the file system—anytime they want to use it. The library, built from one book to in excess of 600; the folders built from one file folder to 3,500; the photo file built from a cardboard box to 400.

And there are other reasons I established this file: okay, a photographer comes in, he's carrying eighteen units, he says, "I want to work for the *Sagebrush*." Okay, I have a story breaking on a personality in the History Department or personality in the Sociology Department. I have to look at this student and say, "We need a photograph of this personality." Well, these are mostly standard, stock type portraits. So if a photographer in the past has taken, say, a roll of film on this particular person and they developed up three or four photos, and the paper uses one photo, why then waste a person's time saying, "Go out, find this person." Everyone knows the faculty. If they're not in class, they're in consultation. If they're not in consultation, they're at home doing research. If they're not there, then they're in the library. They're hard to pin down. So why waste a person's time, who's carrying eighteen units, who needs a picture of a subject? You just open up the file catalog, and there you have it, you have that person's picture. So you're saving that person [photographer] maybe two hours time right there—two hours he could be off covering something else.

This wasn't done in the past, and every year you'd have to come in and restructure the whole thing. I think that's needless; it's duplication of effort. Even by the end of next year, I'll still be finding out areas where there's duplication of effort. What I'm trying to do is cut it down.

For example: [we] put out the first index in the eighty-year history of the paper. Next year when somebody comes in, they will know what happened the previous year. They can look in the index, if they have a story on a particular topic, they can look under that topic in the index, they can read the *Sagebrush*, they can say, "Ah, but there was an error here, or this is a good place to build

a story from." In other words, they don't have to go from scratch like was done this year. We stopped the process of starting from scratch. We're building continuity.

There's a political reason why I ran for reelection [for 1974-75]. But maybe that can be discussed in the next year. We're see how things work out. I'd made my contribution and worked myself to a pretty tired state, and wanted out. Plus I told [off the tape] about physical injuries, medical bills, paying rent, little things like that, and taking classes [laughs].

Well, this editorship sounds like a fulltime lob in itself.

It is a full-time job.

And it has to be done in your spare time.

Well, Hank Nuwer and I, at the beginning of the year, were putting about sixty-five hours a week into the paper. Now, when I'm painting signs for twenty hours a week, and I'm taking classes, and having to deal with people, I'm amazed that both of us made it. Hank and I are now just—we call each other up on the phone a couple times a day and sort of wonder how we managed to survive. He's got his dissertation to do right now, and he's had to add an extra week onto what I put out.

There's a difficulty here, too, with being the editor of a paper. If you'll check, I think you'll find that the only person in recent history who was really, college senior age, typically twenty-two, twenty-three age range, was Sheila Caudle. (And Sheila Caudle and I've been close friends, since 1969.) Now, there's a reason for this. One, that this school, somehow, they didn't have the continuity of staff, they didn't have a continuity of tradition. (Tradition's one of those fickle

things where everybody just points at it and says, “Well, that’s tradition.” Well, tradition can be radically altered and become the new tradition, just like I was talking about track records, or what-have-you.)

The pressures on an editor, if they’re not prepared for them, can sometimes be very disturbing. For example, early this year when we’d been having a few problems with people, there was an instance when a member of the Board of Regents was indicted by a federal grand jury for aiding a client in income tax evasion. Well, we had been already under certain pressures from groups here on campus—ASUN, the publications board, a couple of faculty members who were displeased with something that had happen. Now, point B: if a person hasn’t had a little experience with people or with the outside world— and I talk about the outside world, away from community, academic affairs and so forth—the idea of being a professor in the Journalism Department is profoundly different than being in, say, a working everyday news room of a newspaper or a television station, profoundly different. One’s ideological and one’s practical. Okay, a Board of Regents member doesn’t like what you have to say about him. Well, the next thing you know is, he puts a little pressure on you, you’re worried about graduating, and you’ll tone that story down. That’s a mistake.

We had a situation arise where if the same type of thing had happened to a student, say, being indicted by a federal grand jury, that student under the current code for student behavior would in all likelihood be dismissed from school until his guilt or innocence was proven. And this happened in a case at the Las Vegas school, which later blew up into a full scale battle over student funding. (Which we defended, and Terry Reynolds defended.) Terry and the editorial staff of the *Sagebrush*,

at a very early date in the year, realized that we were looking out for the same group. And we established a new rapport, whereas originally, even we’d had our disagreements with Reynolds.

We went after the member on the Board of Regents and pointed out this discrepancy almost as a sort of irony. Well, the next thing we know is, we’re being criticized, one, in an editorial in the *Reno Evening Gazette*, [two], we’re being criticized on the front page by the Board of Regents. And yet, the whole argument was about, student funding, was that the regents have the power to put a checks and balances on money spent by student government. And they were saying, “Well, poppycock, we wouldn’t interfere with the student publications or speakers or concerts. We just want to be concerned with the legality. And we wouldn’t criticize, or hurt the student newspaper.”

The irony which no one seemed to look at was that there we were on the front page of the *Reno Evening Gazette* being criticized by the Board of Regents, who, in turn, were wanting to oversee the student newspaper. And I’m saying to myself, “There’s proof positive that if they didn’t like what was going on down at the *Sagebrush*, they’d give you the axe any time they felt inclined.”

For example, say your budget’s \$42,000. Well, the regents wouldn’t say, “We’re going to censor the newspaper, but, that’s a little too much money to spend on a student newspaper. We’re going to make it \$38,000” [laughs]. The next thing you know is you’re cut right there.

It doesn’t take a genius to figure out that if you had a speaker, who was controversial and his fee was \$2,000, and that’s what he was requesting, and the student body said, “Yes, we’re going to pay him \$2,000,” and the Board of Regents says, “No, that’s too much money,”

well, that's censorship. See? But they would have it camouflaged under the idea that it was too much money, rather than it was a speaker that they didn't want to have.

Is it possible for the Board of Regents to say anything about how student funds are spent now?

Not as it stands at the time, but they've been trying to get it all year long. The original hassle grew out of a drug bust at Las Vegas, in which students were immediately suspended from school before they had any of their rights protected whatsoever, just because they were implicated in it. Our point was that if the Board of Regents can get together and ask these students to get out of school, then by the same token they're enforcing a code by which they themselves would not adhere to. And this is what we were pointing out. And everybody missed the boat. What they wanted to do was harp on the idea that we were telling the Board of Regents how to handle this case.

Well, case in point would be that we were having the Board of Regents telling us what we could put [in] for editorial policy and they were criticizing us on the front page of the *Reno Evening Gazette*.

Because you criticized the regents?

Because we criticized Mr. Morris. But our point was taken and their point wasn't. So consequently, something which grew out of, say, intimidation or censorship, or whatever, the *Gazette*, "lofty" that it is in the community, it hit us with their editorial saying that a man should have his day in court and all this lofty idealism, and they've been so conservative ever since I've lived in Nevada, I don't usually bother to read it [the paper].

I can point out other forms of censorship which I find ironical. What happened was, in the *Gazette* editorial they said, well, a person gets his day in court. And I don't know if I can remember the exact issue that this came out in, but they were saying Cassius Clay was crucified by the press before he got his day in court. So they were using this as a parallel to our treatment of the regents. So I looked at Hank Nuwer, and I said, "Hank, there's no way—there's absolutely no way that the *Reno Evening Gazette* ever defended Cassius Clay in his case against draft evasion." I said, "My memory, like I point out to other people, is not an encyclopedia, but I know the philosophy of that paper enough to remember that they were not gentle with Mohammed Ali." So I told Hank, "I'll bet you 100 dollars, being of Nevada mint, that you're going to—. I'm going to give you an assignment and that's to go over to the archives and find editorials or stories that the *Reno Evening Gazette* has carried on Cassius Clay, Mohammed Ali—they refer to him as Cassius." I said, "There's no way they'd back him up." And so he came back with not one, but *two* editorials in the *Gazette*—headlines for the editorials on "Cassius Clay's" attempt to avoid induction [were] [*Gazette* headline] "Disgusting" [laughs]. And, of course, we ran that, and pointed out to the "beloved" *Reno Evening Gazette* that they weren't as noble as they were pretending to be. We've had this case arise a couple of times this year. But what the irony is, once we finish with those people who thought they had us by the throat, they had to realize ultimately that we had a case before we put it down in print. We've made a couple of slip-ups, but nothing of a horrendous nature. A couple of small slips.

We let a columnist one time "intimate" that perhaps there was a certain professor who wasn't doing his job quite up to par.

And I'd known this fellow [the professor] for some time, and I thought that it would have gone by-the-bye and wouldn't have caused any ripples. The fellow wasn't even named. But evidently he knew exactly who we were talking about, because the next thing I know is that we were getting a letter to the editor defending him and he was "very" upset. And the student came to me (he was writing under a pseudonym—and I could explain the philosophy on pseudonyms, too, if you want to get into that). And he said he tried to get out of this particular professor's class, because now he's [the professor] been asking in the classroom who was writing this particular column. And he didn't dare say because he thought that the teacher would flunk him.

And I said, "Oh, no way," I said, "He's got a good sense of humor. There's no problem."

And he said, "Well, you just don't know him as well as you think you do." And I've found this out in my life "several" times. So I just assured him that he was probably being too excitable about the whole thing and to drop it. Well, the next thing I know is, I'm walking out of the office and this very professor corners me at the *Sagebrush* and walks the equivalent of three city blocks with his head about two inches from my face *demanding* that I tell him "who" the student was that wrote this particular column. And—yeah—I realized at that time that indeed, this professor was touchy enough to go to those extremes to probably really flunk the student.

Was the article libelous?

No. Because a lot of people agreed with it [laughs]. The sidelight of this particular story was that this professor wound up spending the rest of the year being well prepared for class. So there are things that do happen that have unforeseen consequences.

You didn't feel that as censorship or a pressure that you had to bow under though?

No. This is what I'm talking about—if a person is in a position, say, as an editor and—I'll put it this way, some people think something is good for somebody else and yet they won't adhere to that same sort of demand personally. Now, I know, someone who's very liberal who is absolutely in a big push to roast people who are conservative. And they will go to all sorts of extremes to find juicy material on these parties. So, this same person one time had a brother who was busted for swiping a car and got caught smoking marijuana in a dorm. Well, this person who was always out to show the holy road to everyone else went into a tailspin trying to keep that piece of information out of the newspaper. I find that schizophrenic, and I find it semi-hypocritical. And I wouldn't do anything like that. But what I'm saying is, these people expect something of someone else, something they can't hold up to. Every once in a while, I have to point this out to people. I make mistakes like that. I do. But I "ultimately" have to come to the conclusion that what's fair and what's being done to one person, if the same thing happens to somebody else, you "have" to report it. Sorry about that, but that's just the way it is.

What you have at the *Sagebrush* is a situation in which there is a budget allotted. Now, when you talk about a \$42,000 budget, you have to remember that 25-, 27,000 dollars of that money is actually outlaid for the cost of printing. For office equipment, the *Sagebrush* possesses, six typewriters, two of which are in good working condition. They have small amounts of photography equipment. It was stolen the year before I came in, and we have not yet had the money allotted to replace it. We owned about eleven desks, and about eight file cabinets, one light table. The

light table was purchased this year because I worked for free the previous summer for the University. There was no budget allotted. And in that budget I told the pub board, at the beginning, that I'd built this file system, and equivalent hours working, I would like to use that money matched by the publications board to buy a light table. That was the first piece of equipment that we could really say represents a working office.

Now, the *Sagebrush*—if in the future someone could get everything together well enough, if they would get a waxer, if they could get a headline machine, if they could get a copy computer, and if they could get a developer for that copy, cold type that comes out of the computer, [they] could probably save enough money within, four to five years to cut that budget by at least a third and *own* the equipment. I have tried to explain this to people, that by spending money, in the long run, you save money. People won't buy that, but the fact of the matter is that if the University possessed this equipment, they could get more people down there working in that office learning facets of the publication trade that would be valuable to them. Whereas, at the current time, we have to go out to whatever contractor takes in the contract for the publication of the *Sagebrush*.

Now, a vignette is that the *Sagebrush* is being charged thirty-four dollars per page to be printed. Well, I know that certain other publications that were being produced there were being produced for less money. But it's a University contract, and people know what they can "get" from established contracts.

Now, when I was elected editor, the price, it was well known, was going to go up. However, since this particular firm knew that I knew what their operation was, the price didn't go up, but remained at thirty-four dollars per page. I found great irony in

this, because actually by having hired me the publications board unwittingly saved themselves about \$1800 in printing costs. By actually having rehired me for the upcoming year, they have just saved themselves another \$1800, because the company that it may go to also knows that I know what the printing cost is. And it is now almost in line, which is another plus for the University. There's a bit of scandal for you [laughing]!

At the end of last year, someone had broken into the *Sagebrush* office in the old building and had lifted about a thousand dollars worth of equipment. Now, this was reported. This equipment wasn't replaced, but the equipment that is now in use in the current *Sagebrush* office, some of it, was purchased out of this year's photography budget, but, in candor, it has to be admitted that most of the equipment did belong to Marlene Olsen. And we will still have to go to this year's incoming publication board and request funds for the equipment that Marlene Olsen will be taking with her because it does belong to her.

But now, the new room for the dark room, which is a combination room for both the *Artemisia* and the *University of Nevada Sagebrush*, is excellent—excellent facilities.

There is one more thing I'd like to point out. A lot of people were giving me a bit of hassle this year because we hit Richard Nixon hard. But I must say that there's an old axiom, you know, you stop the presses "to put news on." Well, I worked for a publisher here in Nevada, who at one time had allowed his editor to put a cartoon of Richard Nixon [mine] on the cover of the publication. Okay. In the first hour that that newspaper was on the streets, there were twelve phone calls complaining about the caricature of the President. This nearly got me fired [laughs] because he was very concerned about what the public's reaction

to his newspaper was. Well, it turned right around. Another editor from another paper picked up the same cartoon, who is also being published by the same person, and put it on the front page of his newspaper because he thought it was a funny cartoon. Well, the publisher walking into the backshop, saw this particular cartoon coming off the press and he made them stop the presses, and take the cartoon off and rerun the whole newspaper. Because of that one cartoon. Throughout my life, my political philosophy and my opinion of Richard Nixon has gotten me into hot water. So I must say when it finally came my turn to be able to make a decision of whether I wanted to put in political commentary about Richard Nixon, regardless of current or past Nevada philosophy regarding the man, that's one reason I went ahead and put him in the paper.

Well, the one fellow who was the editor of one of these Nevada weeklies ultimately got fired. And I have found that in Nevada one has a tendency to be fired more often than not for doing a good job rather than doing a bad job. He was fired, so I called him and I just asked him (this was after Watergate broke) and I said, "Did any of those people [who wrote] letters to the editor complaining about the presence of Richard Nixon's cartoon on the front page, or made those telephone calls, ever apologize to you?" And he immediately cracked up in great raucous laughter. I don't know what he is doing now, but he got the point rather quickly. But I almost lost my job at the same place. I was walking around for a week and a half wondering when I was going to get my pink slip because I was too outspoken on Mr. Nixon's political philosophy.

Now, this was before you became editor of the Sagebrush?

Right. I worked in a newspaper shop before that.

Winkler's cartoons this year have been—.

Well, we work in tandem on a lot. Perhaps I could touch on some things right there. In contrast to my style, Larry Winkler can draw a cartoon in anywhere from forty-five minutes to a couple of hours. It takes me about a day to two days to draw a cartoon. Quite obviously, I didn't have that kind of time this year. And so, there were a lot of things like, for example, the cartoon of the White House being surrounded by troops with rifles. I wanted to get that idea on paper and so I just turned to Larry and I said, "Can you give me a drawing of the White House with troops stationed on the lawn?" There it was, an hour later, the cartoon.

Also, in directing certain people, there was a story on—I've always admired Ed Olsen, and I wanted to get stories of people, about people on this University campus who have been doing a good job but who have—. You know if a person does a good job, in some cases, and they're very steady about it, a lot of people have a tendency to ignore their existence. I mean if you go out and you stir up a little trouble, you get your name in print, but if you're very competent and very good (and I'll make a distinction between being competent and doing an excellent job) doing an excellent job, and being very quiet about it, you sometimes do not get quite the recognition that I think some people deserve. Anne Howard falls in that category (from the English department); Ed Olsen, from the Office of Information; Ahmed Essa, perhaps not for recognition in the English department, but his outstanding photography; Dr. Lilly in the P.E. department. People like this who really deserve campus attention, who don't get it, for whatever reason. "Good news is not news," so to speak.

So I gave out the story of Ed Olsen to one of the reporters, and I've got to laugh because it was Hank. Hank was really miffed because he didn't want to write a story about Ed Olsen. And Hank got over there, and he started talking to Ed Olsen. Hank was gone for about five hours and he came back and he says, "You know, that's one of the most interesting people on campus?"

And I said, "Well, I sort of suspected that." It was one of the best stories that we had for a feature. Ed Olsen's a very entertaining, very competent person. I'm glad we ran the story.

Also, while I'm on the subject, I want to get into what we talk about, "stepping on toes." Now, I have known some really excellent people who have taught school at the University of Nevada, who are no longer here. This delves into the area of what I was talking about, someone being at the same time very competent, very creative, and outspoken. These people have a tendency, and I don't know why it is, but Nevada attracts this type of a personality. And these people are around for a couple of years and then community pressure on them becomes so great that they despair in not being able to live to the fullest their concept of freedom is. This could be explained probably a lot more in detail. But I have known some fine people go through the Philosophy Department, the Art Department, the English Department, etc. A good friend of mine was in biochemistry, a lovely lady, and she was very quiet, very unassuming, did her research, but she happened to antagonize a few people that she shouldn't have. The next thing you know was that she was going to be on her way out. I told her about this, I said, "Let us do a story on you, let us sort of make people aware of your existence." And she says, "No, I want to wait and see how things turn out." And I said, "Well, if you wait long enough, you won't be here for us to even write a story on you."

She's not here any more. So rather than let this happen to a couple of other people that I admire (and this is my decision), I started assigning certain personality pieces to people, not with the intention of finding out what these people would have actually in their heart believe about the school, but at least to make other people aware of their existence on campus. And I had this in mind when I sent out a lot of people to cover personality stories.

A case in point would be the situation that was taking place up in the athletic department. Now, there was a lady there who was what they call raising perhaps a bit of flack around that department, asking, and, within all her rights, for *equitable* distribution of funding for athletics. Now, I have inside information, and I've had so much stuff come to me this year that just couldn't even reach its way into print. One, because it was libel; two, because it couldn't be proved even though I knew a great deal of it was true. So I said, "Well, then, the next thing is if we cannot get this person to give us a comment on the way she feels, at least we'll make the campus aware that this person exists."

Sure enough, after we wrote that story she really started coming out more and defending her case a little stronger, and she came to the point where, unlike say, a person like Anne Howard, who is so outspoken, who is so confident, that people would not dare deal with her on a level where they could get rid of her because she has made herself very prominent. I think this is good. But some people are unwilling to take that step—if you want to call it self-publicity—to make themselves known, make their case known, to a larger audience.

Now, this year, what's good is that we have made people aware of the existence of these people. What I would like to do next year is to follow up on these interviews and to say,

“Look, a year later things have happened, now what do you really think?” Because you see, we have a chance here to—this goes back to the old theme of continuity—we have a chance to build. So we can go to a person and we say, “All right, what does bother you about this department? What is your gripe about this? Why do you feel this way?” And they don’t feel the intimidation of being, you know, having reprisal acted against them.

I know one outstanding painter who came here from Berkeley. This man was really competent. He was here for two years. His disenchantment with the state—I qualify that—he *loved* the state, he liked the environment, and for the most part, he liked the people. He could not stand the people he was dealing with at the University nor the way that he was treated. For a fact now, when that man has an art show and he prints his resume on a brochure, there’s a two-year period of his life that’s left blank. Those are the two years he taught at the University. If this man had stayed here, he would have been a credit to the University. I know a lot of people who’d leave here and wind up being department chairmen at other schools, and here meet with nothing but criticism. I really would like to see that kind of mentality changed.

The situation with the awards. My personal philosophy is that I don’t agree with awards because I know that on certain levels it becomes a superficial appraisal of work. I know the kind of pressure that people are under to make awards. A case in point would be one time I was asked to judge an art show for children, and I [was] to get my picture with the governor of Nevada and with the attorney general. And everybody’s saying, “No, not really,” because there’s a consideration to be made here. One, creatively, children can be really *hurt* at an early age, say, with the bestowal of awards. And I’ve worked teaching

classes enough to know that there’s no such thing as an uncreative child. (There is such a thing as an uncreative adult. But, you have to socially ask yourself where do these things happen. What stops it?) So I’m not really that enamored with awards. Second, the judge, the quality of judge, *who’s* judging the contest? I was in a contest one time at a high school level: nothing; at county level: nothing; state level: nothing; and sent to New York and I got third place Out of 2,800 winners. That was the same contest, the same submission. So that taught me something about awards. Plus, as I say, experience with working with people and their reaction to ’em.

But this year, I must say, I took sort of a “fiendish” delight when after having had so much criticism directed at the newspaper for one, being “arty” and two, that I sort of took offense to that. Because it’s like looking at a person—I knew a person and do know a person, who walks around in baggy pants, old flannel shirt, hair cut that looks like it was self-inflicted; this person’s father taught at Yale, his grandfather taught at Yale, he’s a graduate of Yale, terrific mind, terrific mind. And I know as soon as somebody sees him, they say, “Well,” you know, “who’s that old bum?”

The same thing, the same kind of thing—you can make an observation there, you can use a corollary and you can look at a newspaper, and all of a sudden because the newspaper *looks* presentable, there’s something suspect. Well, I take offense to that because first of all this year, I wanted to put a different kind of news into the paper. And after a staff was molded that could get this news, I wanted to start—and you can go back and look at the early issues of the *Sagebrush* and you’ll find that not nearly the attention is paid to the physical format of the paper as much as the content.

After the staff was resolved and people knew what they were responsible for and knew where to look for the news, then I could start to direct my attention, which was the overall appearance and coordination of the paper. And it started to fall together the second semester. Which if anybody wants to go back and go through the fifty-three issues of volume eighty, well, fine. It did start to fall together. But still, superficially, people looked at the newspaper and said, "Well, it's an arty newspaper. Oh, hum. The others must have been better."

I think this is ridiculous. A case in point would be (which I took great delight in having happened) the *University of Nevada Sagebrush* was voted third best paper on the West Coast. The two papers that beat it were daily newspapers. [Among] the papers the University of Nevada beat were Berkeley, Stanford, UCLA—some good name West Coast newspapers. Well, if the *Sagebrush* was so "arty," I would like to have someone, carefully, lucidly, explain to me why we wound up with an award like that. This is for content and for news value and not for physical appearance. As a matter of fact, we didn't even get a "typography" award in that contest.

But in the Rocky Mountain Press Association, which came out toward the end of the year—of course, we only knew of four contests; we entered four contests, and we received awards in four. We received a first place best all around newspaper in Rocky Mountain. There were fifty papers in that competition.

Now, I told Hank, "This is one of the few times you're going to ever find where you've done a good job and received recognition for it the same time you did it. It's a rarity." And I'll stand by this paper this last year. There's so much more that could have been better, but I think we started right at the bottom and we

wound up in strong position. We wound up in a position where people would actually look at the *Sagebrush* as something to be read and perhaps a member of the University, that the University'd be happy to have around, rather than say, "Well, it's that thing over there in the basement of the building."

In the case of these awards, do you feel that you were being judged by your peers, by journalism people who would know what to look for in a newspaper, and judge it on its professional merits?

Obviously, you'd have to say that it was based on professional merits because the people who were in charge of these contests are journalism people. And it's not a matter of peers as much as it's—you see, you have to realize that [ml a lot of schools, the journalism department actually runs the papers. And there was a time at this University where you wouldn't get a story in the newspaper unless the journalism department approved of it. Now, it's independent and I can trace back the history for that reason also.

A friend of mine who now lives in Australia was running the student newspaper over here, and he was very unhappy with the setup of the journalism department having such a say in the production and in the content of the student newspaper. Unhappily for the journalism department, and I think happily and for the benefit of "journalism", he moved away from the journalism department. I pointed this out earlier. Students who think that they are very independent will come down and work on the *Sagebrush*. And they'll say, "Now, wait a minute, you can't do this because this is unjournalistic."

I look at it and say, "Now, wait a minute. You just got through telling me that you want to look at this with an open mind."

Early in the year, I found out the number one taboo of all journalism was to print an ad on the front page. So I said that's silly. About three papers later, we happened to be running only about eighty inches of advertising. And I said, "Well, this is a great time; we're going to put all of the ads on the front page." And we did.

Then somebody came along and said, "We can't put ads in a double truck."

Fine. So we put a double truck of ads.

What were some of the other—? It was fun. Because actually, it's not "only" for the devilishness of it. It's like saying, look, you have a taboo, but it's really meaningless, and so why?

Now, also the student newspaper, they'll say the ads have to be built around stories. They have to be at the bottom of the page in pyramidal structure, etc. Well, my philosophy is, the students want to read their newspaper. If they're going to read the ads they're going to read the ads. So we started building block ads, which I think is quite a change. And so we put all the ads on one page, say, on page 14, or page 16, or page 12. And the irony is (here also sort of retribution) that the advertising revenue for the paper, if the record were checked, is up considerably this year, because people realize people read the newspaper. Consequently, they want to advertise in the paper. So what do you have? Well, everyone has their ads on the same page. Maybe so, but why are they coming to the *Sagebrush* this year in droves wanting to advertise in it?

Number one, I would like to think that I do know at least at the end of the year what the weaknesses or strengths of the *Sagebrush* were. And I found out one area that came under criticism was say, "campus news." But I look upon this year's *Sagebrush* as sort of one, a beginning; two, sort of a social/psychological overview of what's been going

on. If people go through the paper and they *read* it, they start to get a feeling about where things are really sort of headed. One, I would say the emphasis on female athletics, female personalities on campus, giving them due. Say, ethnic groups on campus. very certain deliberate areas that I set Out, the recognition of say, the School of Agriculture, ROTC news.

I think the idea this year was to begin to cultivate a situation by which the person who would be coming in—I told several people about the middle of the year I'd love to be the editor coming in next year and be at the position where this paper is now, because for once, instead of having to come in and build everything from scratch, and then say, "ah, I'm through" at the end of the year, "let the next nut take this thing over," he could actually come in and have a frame of reference to build from.

So consequently, I'd say the weak area was, was actual news reporting on campus events, things that are coming up right then and immediately, you know, immediate news. That is a failing. But it's very difficult to find someone who could have handled that kind of an obligation, and at the same time handled the pressure of the paper, just all this other stuff that had to be done. Now, having the background that we do have this year, having basically the same staff which—I had promised I was going to try to build up a staff that would come back, rather than a staff that just goes Out the window. And this was one reason I ran for reelection, because I saw handwriting on the wall which said all that work isn't going to work out because a different philosophy was going to be coming in which says, "no, that was the wrong way to do it."

And it just seemed like a shame to see all of that go. In one year's time to build up, and watch the bottom fall out. So I have people, I do have people now who have expressed willingness to work, who've expressed a

willingness to handle beats. So consequently, the burden say, of putting out the physical format of the paper next year will be left to four people. And the remainder of the staff is going to be paid to go out and get the kind of news which was lacking in this year's paper.

But see, a lot of people don't seem to understand. Say, if a person was good at that type of coverage will turn around and let the other types slide. So what you're doing is you're saying, "Oh, well, ninety-five percent of the ship is safe, but look at the five percent, you know, where the water's coming in." And so then they go over and they patch up the hole and they forget about the other ninety-five percent of the ship and you wind up sinking. 'Cause they're not watching out for what was already assumed to be having been done the right way. And I think that was part of the major consideration I had, when I decided to salvage what happened this year.

What people have a tendency to do—say, if I'm sitting in the office and twenty people during the course of the day come to me with a story. They assume that the story they bring is, like, the most important story in the paper. Well, you know, you listen to twenty different people who have these stories and they assume that their one part is the most important. And you're having to sit there saying, "Okay, now story number two, now story number three, story four, etc." Well, they miss that but you have to keep all these things in your head. And say, 'Okay, this is really a very important story, and this one isn't.' But still to each one of those separate one of the twenty people, what they gave you is the most important.

Okay, well, last year's editor said, "Well, I feel sorry for you because there just isn't any news at the University of Nevada campus."

Well, I'm "sorry" about that, but there's a "ton" of news up here. And as I intimated earlier, there's a lot of very exciting news on this

campus that one, is (quite honestly) libelous, very inflammatory and dangerous, whether or not it's true. I can listen to stories like that three and four hours a day but there's nothing I can do about them because one, you'd probably wind up getting a person fired, competent though they may be at their particular job, something that they have done. We may go into things like this next year. We may really try and do more research on it and find out.

A community of five thousand people there's bound to be things going on. Quite obviously, the biggest [campus] story of this year—one of the biggest—happened before school started and that was the resignation of N. Edd Miller. We didn't have any student uprisings. I've always been very skeptical about the benefit of those type of things anyway. The point is, there's so many situations.

Now these are the little vignettes, sidelights, and what-have-you. Say you have a situation here, where you have a steady population at the University. Steady population by my definition is staff (meaning administrators, higher echelon personnel, faculty) people who stay at this University, anywhere from five to twenty years. Now, these people are your—I don't mean static but—there's another word for stable—it's a population that is there. Now, your students come in, they learn the ropes, they're terrified out of their wits usually when they're freshmen. And the ones who—well, whatever. Then you go to your sophomores and they learn a little bit more, etc. It'll go all the way up to the line. And by the time they're senior, maybe the second semester, they're trying to get some things accomplished that they hadn't done the prior three and a half years.

Well, they turn over. So what you have is, your seniors going Out, your sophomores and juniors moving up, and the incoming class, so you have a tremendous turnover of personnel,

which detracts from their credibility in the eyes of the administration and faculty, because they assume that they are coming in and they're going to be going out. So they're not really a force to be reckoned with. And this is one reason that so many of the student rights fall by the way because the people who are defending them just turn over and the people coming in maybe didn't necessarily agree with 'em, or they want to make their own mark and they don't really follow up. And so you lose that valuable piece of continuity. I could go further into this, but I find that sort of an unhappy situation because the faculty and the administration assume that say, someone who's given you a little trouble will be gone sooner or later. And that's "not" too healthy.

I find that, like, with a friend of mine. I've [known] a lot of people go through Ph.D. programs. This one fellow really *busted* his ethics, his mind, his morality to get a Ph.D. He'd do anything for it. It's a little gross, but he finally got his doctorate degree. And we were sitting down after he'd finished the problem and we were talking it over and I said, "Well, now that you've gone through this, are you going to go back and, you know, taking this all into consideration, all the hassle you went through and all the garbage that they threw on you, are you going to go easy on people when you're teaching?"

And he said, "Hell, no, I'm going to give 'em back the same kind of crap that I got."

Now, a lot of people would maybe kind of snicker at this mentality. But I'll tell you, it's on the loose a lot more than people want to admit. I find that very, very unfortunate. It's an unhappy thing. Students pay the faculty's salary. If there were no students there would be no administration, there would be no University of Nevada. And I think a lot of people lose sight of that, also think they lose sight of what students really need.

They assume what's good for students—and maybe it isn't good for them at all; it happens to be good for the party whoa s trying to get the particular piece of power, i.e., the Board of Regents. I think the number one responsibility of the Board of Regents is not a stepping stone into Nevada politics, but for what the job stands for, and that's looking out for student interests. A lot of them lose sight of that, very quickly. As soon as they get elected, they lose sight of it. It's unfortunate. I can cite examples, but I'm going to lay off of it.

You can't handle that sort of thing as a news story.

No, but you can handle it as an editorial. And I think—see, this is another thing. The pressure of a student carrying certain work load and also being worried about the pressures of censorship, or slipping up, or printing incorrect news, that pressure can be so ominous at times, that the student newspaper is dismissed with just a flicker. But if the tradition were established there where a newspaper—student newspaper—it's just personal community prejudice, that's all.

The *University of Nevada Sagebrush* is—I don't know what—is it the fifth largest weekly Nevada—somewhere around there. Yes, it's a large paper. I'm not sure if that's the exact number where it fits on the scale, but it has the budget and it has an obligation to print news. It does.

Well, I can just go back to it—that I would be pleased with this paper, regardless of the feedback on the awards. But that was just an extra benefit of doing the paper. Now as far as—I would hate like hell next year say, if I come back, you know; it's all contingent on Hank Nuwer still, even. But I'd be disappointed if the paper next year isn't better than it was this year. For example, the first semester we

thought we'd done a good job and yet there's hardly any comparison between the first semester's paper and the second one. As far as quality's concerned, it's better.

Technical points: an example of small things falling together that people wouldn't recognize; if we run a name, say the last name by a story, that means that person works for the staff. If we ran a full name of a person by a story, it meant that it was a one-time contribution. If we ran a name at the bottom of the article, it was an article which was turned in by, say, a student here at the University. And there seems to be another taboo about journalism; unless it's really a sensational story, you don't get a by-line. But I figured that if a student isn't being paid for submitting a story, and had taken maybe an hour and a half or two hours to write up a story, then we'd give them a by-line at the bottom of the story, which was like a third indication.

I run cut-lines for photographs on the same principle. If they work for the paper full-time, use their last name; if it's a one-time submission, run their full name.

A lot of people look at it and they say, "Well, that's a mistake." But it's an internal kind of a working that, if people will pay close attention to the paper will realize that these are *consistent* rather than *inconsistent* attitudes of the newspaper. A lot of people look at it and say, "Well, it's a mistake. It's not. It was deliberate and planned.

Same thing with the date cut-lines. If say, for example, a cut-line of a date interferes with the typography of the page, if say, there's a cartoon in the corner and the date-line's right above that cartoon and it distracts from the cartoon, we'll take out the cutline. Well, that's interpreted as a mistake in journalism. Well, It's not. It interfered with the flow of the page. Et cetera.

Another thing with format, the six-column format. A lot of people don't agree with that. Well, this is something that we had to make up our mind for ourselves whether we wanted something that was convenient or we wanted something that was aesthetically pleasing. And actually, numerically, something that has an odd number actually creates attention all its own. Even numbers, such as a paper, say, that's done on a nine and a half pica scale is very consistently even-looking. And that's why we broke it up into three different pica sizes. A nineteen and a half pica size makes for a three-column newspaper. So we can fluctuate back and forth between pica sizes and stories. But if you go through the paper, you'll notice that we don't really vary those pica sizes that dramatically. You'll see nine and a half in a nine and a half pica area. There are nineteen picas in a three-column area, so forth.

We came into a certain degree of criticism about using the front cover of the newspaper for say, photographs or art work. Well, take this into consideration. Somebody brought this up one time and I—maybe none too tactfully—snapped back, that if that seemed to displease 'em, we'd run that picture in the middle of the newspaper and put "news notes" on the front page. Well, that person [laughs] didn't think far enough ahead to say, "Well, we didn't want that in there to begin with." I'm speaking particularly about the vice president of publications at the time. And they said, "Oh, I see your point" [laughs]. Well, whatever.

My philosophy of that was, if some people brought it up, and they'd make a comment about something, I'll say, "Well, a great deal of decision-making goes into the cover of the *Sagebrush*." For example, we ran one cut on the front and I knew what I had in mind for the cover, but it took me almost researching through a thousand pages before I found the right one for the front page.

I like the staff this year. I'll have to put that in there. There's very few people on the staff that finally by the end of the year, didn't realize what was going on. And I think most of the people were pleased that they got to work on the paper. And also, I think, a change was that most people started taking pride in the paper. It wasn't a matter of saying, "This is my story and that's the only part of the paper that's really important." Most of the people were wise enough towards the end of the year to realize that, one story doesn't make the newspaper, one photograph doesn't make a newspaper. A lot of people thought they put a lot of work into the paper and at the end of the year, when they started looking at the index, realized that there was—this is the second time, I think, I've jumped back to it but—there was a social/psychological overview to the whole thing, which created a consistency to news and a consistency to asking people after they've read a story, what do they think of it. Rather than just sort of pabulum-fed news that sounded alike, there was enough in the paper to keep people moving on to the next page.

There's a lot of puns in the paper, you know. But I think too, we came into a certain amount of criticism there on the amount of puns.

Who criticized you?

Originally, the publications board was a bit unhappy, because it was such a radical break. It is a radical break because you start looking through newspapers, and the headline basically tells you what you are about to read. A really explanatory headline will almost tell you what you're going to read before you read it and what it's about, and so forth.

Well, our philosophy was that, one, if we went to the trouble to edit a story, to have a story assigned, that we at least owed the writer due. And a lot of people say for example—I

harp on it maybe too much, but say—a story about the agriculture department. Now a lot of people, as soon as they see that a story's going to be about the agricultural department, could care less and they just turn over to something else. What we would do is that we'd run sort of a semi-amusing headline, and get people's curiosity up, and the next thing you know, they're reading an article which they ordinarily wouldn't have been attracted to and they find that maybe, there was something in that article of value.

I can point out the same sort of correlations say, a foreign language. (I'm a great one for correlations.) But what happens here is, you say you have a student take a requirement that they really can't stand. And the next thing you know is, because they're required to take it, they get about three or four months into the course and they find out that they actually enjoy it. The next thing, you have, not someone who's turned away by a *requirement* but actually turned on to a *subject*. And this is why, during the course of the year that I have my own concept about language requirements. But I realize that there is a definite plus, because you realize most people from foreign countries can speak not only their own language and English, but a third language. That's very healthy and it also helps you learn a lot about people. It's the difference between an oral tradition and someone who "gestures". You miss a lot, you miss a lot. And I think in a language, if you expect someone else only to communicate in your language you're really missing out by not trying to communicate in theirs. The liability is that most Americans never get a chance to put the language that they've learned into practice, a foreign language. And I think that at times is sort of irritating to someone who's trying to find a reason why they're taking just a "requirement." So I use a parallel that actually, you learn something that you're not always prepared [to].

Okay, here's a typical example. Here we have a headline here, and it's a presentation of an "outstanding student teacher" award. Now, most people, they just look at it and say, well, whatever. But the caption is called "The Cain and the Able." Well, Dr. Cain is— Dean Cain is—giving the award and the "able" are the students. So if somebody sees the caption "Cain and the Able" and they're led into it and the next thing you know is, they're reading the story.

I could go on forever. We only had just a very few headlines offend people, but I pointed out to somebody one time, "Look, we're running a news note section in every paper, there's got to be at least anywhere from twelve to twenty stories in the news notes. And you multiply that by fifty-three and you look at the number of headlines just on those few pages, and then the headlines in the total paper, and a lot of 'em are what you call straight journalistic headlines." But I think we only put two this year that were borderline, offensive to the community.

Offensive in what way?

Well, I can make a rationale for both of them. They were double-entendres that somebody didn't like. And I'd read the articles over closely enough to say to myself, "Well, if it's offensive then I'll take the rap for it," but I think they weren't in poor taste.

That's one thing we've been very conscious of. Actually, Hank Nuwer and myself were good sounding boards off each other. We'd laugh at a lot of headlines that we finally, before the end of the evening, had to go back and change because we realized that we just couldn't put them in. We just wouldn't, because of that elusive thing called *good taste*. Well, what's one person's good taste is not another's. A lot of people would just love to see you get roasted on the stake very

issue. But, I look at the same people who espouse say, radicalism, when put on the line themselves, back off immediately. I don't have too much truck with people like that.

I'm constantly having people bump into me and say, "Look, why didn't you go ahead and just roast that person, or do this, or do that?" And I'm looking at a person knowing that they're plenty radical when it comes to speaking but when it actually comes to putting their philosophy in print and signing their name to it, that's another matter.

There's another thing. I was going to talk earlier about pseudonyms. A reporter come in early in the year with a story on a particular political personality in Nevada. And I read the first story and it was a very complimentary piece. Directly underneath that story there was a second story, roasting that political personality, just "ruthlessly". And it had a by-line on it, but it was a pseudonym. But they were written by the same person. I said, "Why are you doing this?"

And well, [he] wanted to stay in good stead with this particular political party and not offend anybody. But at the same time, [he] wanted to point out a few of the negative (or what [he] interpreted as being negative) characteristics of this person. I said, "Well, I can't do it. I won't run this story." And he accused me of censorship.

And I said, "No, it's not true, because for one thing, I'm not going to put a pseudonym on an article that I'm going to have to be responsible for. You know that I will defend your right and not reveal my source, and I'll wind up losing my job." And I looked at the guy, and said, "Quite honestly, I don't think you would do the same thing for me." And that was true. So consequently I said, "If you'll sign your name to the story, we'll run it, and if you don't, we won't run it." We printed the flattering story.

But that's just one vignette, that didn't happen often this year because most of the people began to realize the things that were critical, you were just going to have to take your own responsibility. And I would defend the person if I had the feeling in the back of my mind that they'd back me up. But I wasn't too pleased with that reporter's particular set of ethics.

So pseudonyms, anything in the paper which I thought in the humorous tone, pseudonyms were quite appropriate. But if they were something that could get somebody in trouble—and this is part of just growing with the paper and you find out, something that you just absolutely don't expect any trouble on whatsoever will just get you in an awful lot of trouble. And on the other hand, something that you think is borderline, people will just pass [it] off as if nothing even happened. I found that confusing at times; I really did.

Well, basically what you have here is a University newspaper which is put out by a core of about five to seven people. I'm talking about the physical presentation, not the business side, which is another matter altogether, of circulation. But the actual production of the paper. This very small amount of people is actually producing a product which is read by 5,000.

And that in itself can be very tiring, in trying to anticipate the news, anticipate what is going to be of value, what's going to have entertainment value, informative value. So just for a brief spot here, we'll discuss what it takes to put out the paper.

I usually spend the weekends say, reading everything I can get my hands on—quite obviously a stack of mail that comes to the *Sagebrush* is about eight inches to a foot deep every day. This is the information that comes in. Now, I read a large amount of college newspapers from all over the country. Of

course, I read all the Nevada dailies, I try to read the *LA Times*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Sacramento Bee*, occasionally the *Examiner*. From these papers, I find out information of [regional] national and international value. I save up those articles and show up usually at the Sagebrush between one p.m. and three p.m. on a Sunday afternoon, go through the mail that arrived since Friday, start talking to people who are coming in with photo assignments and story assignments, because we have a six o'clock deadline for news copy. We go through the news copy. This is usually a singular job. I copy edit, mark for pica size, correct copy, correct spelling, organize the stories into pica size, nine and a half picas, nineteen picas, thirty picas. We're starting to accumulate the advertising. The copy's then either reread by Hank Nuwer or Pat O'Driscoll and cut down even further. We work on that copy and type up late-breaking stories, probably until about ten-thirty or eleven o'clock. We take maybe a half an hour break. Then we look it over one final time. Then we put it in a folder and deliver it to the printer. Now, the printer's is about seven or eight miles from the University. Maybe not that far; at that hour, it seems longer.

So I drop the copy of f at the printer's and sometimes that's gone as late as two or three o'clock in the morning, when we have some editorial that we all want to work on and polish up. So the following morning, the copy gets typed up, go back into the office somewhere around ten o'clock, check on the mail, go to classes. About two o'clock at the latest, we go out to the *Tribune* where the copy's come off the computer. We reread the copy, and then after all the proofreading that we've done on the original copy, we have to reread and match that up with the copy that's come off the computer. Now, with cold type, you have to correct the errors right there on the copy. Now, that's a process of—it's a very

tedious process and sometimes can take as long as three and four hours.

Then we start laying the physical layout of the newspaper which is on the flats. We take the copy, we start picking out the appropriate pages to have that copy placed on, you have to have your photographs, which has already been a tedious process of picking out which are the best photos to go into the paper. The copy starts getting laid out, the pictures are put into place, the headlines have to start falling into place, creatively doing the headlines. In other words, the whole physical layout of the paper really takes place starting at about six to seven o'clock in the evening.

At the beginning of the year, we were working as late as sometimes two and three o'clock in the morning on the newspaper. Now, this is Monday evening— that's a long ways since from Sunday. So then on Tuesday morning, the paper is printed by the publisher, then it's picked up by the circulation manager, and distributed around the school at ten o'clock. Between Tuesday about ten o'clock and Wednesday at six o'clock (which is also the deadline), we have to accumulate enough news to build anywhere from a twelve-page to twenty-four-page newspaper in a day and a half.

So we go through news Tuesday afternoon. And usually Tuesday evening, we have that day off to do what we want to do. Starting Wednesday morning we go in, we start sorting through the mail, of course still a continual process—all this process is repeated—of scouring the news that comes through the mail, letters to the editor, building copy, proofreading—it's all continual process. Wednesday at six o'clock, that's the deadline and we repeat the same process that we had Sunday evening. And we deliver the copy to the publisher. And that comes off the computer Thursday morning and then we start again between twelve and two on Thursdays: proof

the copy, size photos, do the physical layout of the paper, and usually wrap it up. The Thursday paper, we are usually out there until around two o'clock in the morning. Friday morning the paper comes out. Friday afternoon is a matter of making up payroll, giving out assignments for people to have delivered to the newspaper office by Sunday at six o'clock. And that process goes on all the way through the year, except for holidays and at Christmas and spring vacation.

We spent more time this year than former editorial staffs have spent in preparing the newspaper because we feel that we want to put out something that we don't have to look at the following morning and say, "Now, why didn't we spend an extra hour making it better?" I think proof of what we've succeeded at doing is that this year's paper is, for newspapers, has a minimal amount of copy errors, minimal amount of grammar errors. We've touched on this before, but I take pride in it, I have to say I do. People want to make sure the paper is as accurate as possible. And that's what we've tried to do.

There are certain things that I tried to explain earlier in the year, either via editorial or just by implication, what was happening in this year's paper. A lot of people didn't pay much attention to that, but by the end of the year, I think they realized that these things happen.

Like for example, last year's publications board. When I told them what I was going to do, I think that most people are so acclimated to having somebody tell them one thing and they don't expect them to be doing it, that perhaps they really don't believe what they're hearing or they disregard it. So consequently, what I have to say is that earlier in the year, I made this statement, that if I found five people who were really willing to work, we could pull the paper off. Secondly, I said that because I knew, formerly, editors who were

on the paper were always hard-pressed even finding one or two people that would really help 'em when they were going that route. [Thirdly], because it is a bi-weekly newspaper, I explained earlier that I was going to attempt a format that stood somewhere between a magazine and a newspaper. Now, that one sentence eluded people, but that was really something of a foundation in the philosophy of building this year's *Sagebrush*. I took the philosophy that it was somewhere between a magazine and a newspaper. Now, later, people brought up certain arguments against that. But the point is that if a newspaper isn't printed every single day, when you come to what they call "scoops" and fast-breaking news, by the time, you see—Wednesday night and Sunday nights are deadlines—if you have a really "hot" story on Sunday, you have to realize that in the University newspaper that news isn't going to break until Tuesday morning. Or if you have a fast-breaking news say, that comes Out Thursday evening, we already have our copy set and we're ready to go. And we can't report that story, because it's going to be breaking in everybody else's newspaper on Friday morning.

Now, this year, if you go back and you look at all the stories in the *Sagebrush* that are typewritten, those are all stories that broke after deadline. Well, see, here you ran into a conflict with established journalistic tradition that all the copy has to be the same. Well, we threw that right out the window, because we said, "What are you sacrificing?" You know, people talk about arty newspaper. "Do you sacrifice the look of your page with consistent pica and column size or do you say, this is a fast story?" It's not accessible to us to have that copy set by the computers. We'd have to type it on a typewriter and we put it in the paper.

Case in point being the N. Edd Miller issue. The total paper was typewritten because the story was so fast-breaking. And we were lucky

enough to get it first, even before the downtown papers. And we broke it exactly at the same time his statement came out that he was resigning. So these are the things that people have to look back on and also take into consideration. They say, "Oh, but that's a sloppy-looking page." No, not really, because that's one of those stories that broke so fast that we had the technical facilities unavailable to us to get it into, you know, "proper form", as they call it.

Also, a thing I'd like to interject in here is the whole syndrome of newspaper reporting, of scooping, of getting the "hot tip." I find a very real danger in the scoop. A case in point this year, with the dearth of files, the skimpy research records, that if a *Sagebrush* say, had a story that they wanted to break, it'd be almost impossible to get the total and accurate information. Of course, anybody who's ever interviewed somebody will testify that about half way through the interview—and once it starts getting typed up, the person no longer wants to lay claim to having said those words, said them, etc. I see a real democratic kind of a danger to scooping, because people have a tendency to remember the sensationalism of the scoop without the real substance of the story.

And I'm a little bit skeptical about the journalism trade, stock in trade of scooping the other fellow, because I've seen a lot of stories that sacrificed accuracy for timeliness and consequently, get burned later. But in the meantime, everybody's talking about "the red hot scoop." And I think there's a real danger there; unless you have the full story, you better hold your peace until you can check out all of your information. And the *University of Nevada Sagebrush* prior to this year didn't have qualified files. And it's still not anywhere near what I would like to see for research files available to staff members to thoroughly do a story justice. I mean that.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE *SAM BASTA, CHAIRMAN*

Sam Basta: My name is Sam Basta, Dean of Community Relations and chairman of the UNR Centennial Committee.

The plans for the Centennial go back approximately 'til 1972. Somewhere in '72, in the fall semester, N. Edd Miller, the president at that time, called me into his office and said that he wanted me to be the director-coordinator for the Centennial here from '74-75. At that time I'd just recently been appointed Dean of Community Relations, and he said, "This is another phase of your job description that we'd like for you to handle."

The problem at that time was, and continues to be: how are we going to finance this? Well, he had indicated that some money would be available from various sources which he was not at liberty at the time to say. Although he did say that he was going to make a special effort to make some sort of recommendation for financing through the legislature, and so forth.

With that in mind, I immediately began to survey approximately seventy-five to 100

universities and colleges throughout the United States who had undergone a centennial celebration. Well, the correspondence was voluminous, and we received many, many ideas and plans and projects and so forth. So then I read continuously on this material, had 'em catalogued and titled and filed for use. (In the meantime, I was involved in other community projects and programs.) This was just a preliminary survey, preliminary review of what was transpiring in other parts of the country. In addition, I began to read a lot of the history of the University of Nevada myself. Although I'm a graduate of the University, I was unfamiliar with much of it.

So, somewhere in the Spring of '73, the president, after much pressure from me to get a committee appointed—because it takes at least two years planning for something like this—although I'd done some preliminary work, we needed some additional members from the University community, students and faculty and alumni, and townspeople, to work with us. So, finally, a committee was appointed in April of '73. We had our first meeting in

April of '73, about the 25th of April. Then we had an organizational meeting in May, somewhere about the middle of May. For the next two meetings we met once a month. For the next two meetings we discussed different approaches to the Centennial, what sort of planning we needed, how long it was going to be, but our major emphasis at that time was selecting a theme and a symbol, upon which the program and the Centennial year would revolve.

So the first meeting was organizational; the second meeting was one in discussing various kinds of themes and symbols and so forth. We discussed it for over two hours and finally realized that the committee (thirteen members) needed additional members and appointment of subcommittees to come up with some sort of a theme, a symbol, and a statement of objectives, which we did. They spent two or three weeks in discussion and deliberation and then presented their findings to the committee as a whole—four statements of objectives, the theme of the Centennial, and a recommendation for a symbol.

Now, the theme finally evolved: "Evolution of a Dream 1874-1974-2074." We then decided that the best approach for developing some sort of logo or seal or Centennial symbol of some kind [would be to work] through the art department under Dr. Howard Rosenberg. [He] took it upon himself, and for the next three months he worked on a design that was acceptable to the committee, which was a Centennial seal, which we have. It has a huge N in the background, with the state of Nevada included within the N, and around the circumference is "The University of Nevada Centennial 1874-1974"—and emanating from behind the N and around the circle is sagebrush—flowering sagebrush—and circles within the state's [outline] we think are silver dollars. That was the design elected. One of

the designs has three lines emanating from the circle, in red, silver, gray, and blue, indicating some sort of going on from 1974 to 2074, the three lines giving one the feeling that we're going on beyond 1974.

So from this, Rosenberg's design, we began planning and established subcommittees. We also recommended to the president that we have three, four, some additional members to the committee, one from the classified personnel, and then we had staff emeritii, Dr. [Charlton G.] Laird, [Everett W.] Harris, [Ralph A.] Irwin, and [Harold N.] Brown, which made us five additional members, eighteen people.

We then decided, at the request of the chairman, that we divide the committee up into six subcommittees. First committee, the group was called the administrative subcommittee. Now, the purpose and function of the administrative subcommittee is to carry out the decisions and the plans and programs of the Centennial Committee, to implement these programs, in addition to being responsible for publicity and for a budget. Now, included in this subcommittee would be people who are administrative officers, and one person from the Chamber of Commerce to tie in the community, who had administrative responsibilities and authority (we could implement programs because of the nature of their areas of responsibilities). For example, Ed Pine is the Vice President of Finance and Business. Now, he would be responsible for all physical resources of the campus. Dr. Irwin would be [responsible for] the academic resources. Myself and my secretary are responsible for student resources, and so on. Publicity, advertising, would come under [Ed] Olsen, in Information. So these people who have areas of responsibility now, at the direction of their chairman, carries out the programs established by the Centennial

Committee—in essence, the chairman and the director of the committee (that's myself), acting under the direct supervision of the president. In other words, whatever I would ask a member of the administrative subcommittee, that is the same as saying the president wants it carried out, from an administrative management point of view.

The purpose of this committee really is that, look, we have to have somebody to coordinate and implement these programs, and this is the coordinating body to do so. Now, in addition to that we have an academic community subcommittee. Now, their responsibilities and jurisdiction are to work with members of the faculty and the various colleges and schools and units and divisions in developing various kinds of programs, projects, etc., to be included on the Centennial calendar of events. This group is primarily concerned with the academic community.

Then we have an alumni program subcommittee. Now, their major responsibility is to make an assessment and a survey within their association in regards to the kinds and types of programs that they would like to have included on the Centennial calendar of events. Then we have a community program subcommittee whose major function will be to make an assessment of the general community, to seek out various interests, ideas, and hopefully whether or not they would work with the community program subcommittee so we could have programs involving the community.

Then, of course, we have a student program subcommittee. Now, the purpose, of course, as the name implies, is that the student subcommittee would be responsible for making an assessment and a survey of existing and proposed ideas of the student body and the ASUN government in regards to the kinds of projects, programs and so forth,

that they would like to organize and include in the Centennial calendar of events.

The other subcommittee is the classified employees subcommittee. They'd be working with classified employees in determining how the classified employees can become involved in the overall Centennial celebration.

The overall person for these various subcommittees is the chairman and director-coordinator; the subcommittees and the administrative subcommittee will be the coordinating body for the Centennial. These committees have been appointed and have been functioning for approximately a year, and as a result of this we have established a calendar of events with various projects and plans and programs. We are still in the process now of finalizing and dovetailing the various requests, programs, ideas and so forth for the '74-'75 academic year.

Now, we, at the beginning, decided that we needed some sort of ideas or some sort of principles upon which to base our projections for the Centennial. One of them has to do with focusing attention on the University. In essence, we felt that every means consistent with good taste should be employed to focus attention of the people of the state, the nation, and probably the world, on the University. And every effort should be made to interpret clearly the distinctive contributions of the University of Nevada. Some of the things that we planned on the basis of this are a newspaper supplement that will be inserted in the *Reno Evening Gazette* and the *Nevada State Journal*. Now, that will have approximately forty-nine pages or more with approximately fifty-two articles about the University. Now, this has been developed in conjunction with the Reno Newspapers, Inc., and also involving the Department of Journalism and the University's Office of Information.

It also must be said here that Dr. James Hulse has written the history of the University of Nevada, which will soon be released, perhaps next month. We have commissioned the Audio Visual Aids Department to develop some historical slides of the University of Nevada, the script written by Dr. Hulse and Dr. [Donald] Potter. We also have plans for radio and TV programs on history of the University. The Alumni Association plans some local and regional celebrations.

And, of course, we're going to invite some nationally and internationally known speakers to participate in the convocations and special events. We also have developed means to encourage and permit other educational institutions, governments, corporations, associations and individuals to salute and honor the University, its teachers, its researchers, and to acknowledge the great discoveries that have been made within its halls. Now, [we've] developed programs for educational institutions and governments and labor organizations, to provide opportunities for extending congratulations to the University. For example, we're going to invite delegates from learned societies, professional associations, delegates from other universities and colleges nationally. We're going to invite state, local, and national leaders. We're going to plan a University of Nevada, Reno, Day by the city of Reno. University of Nevada Day by the Chamber of Commerce. We have planned to have visitations to the campus by members of the state legislature. Various community groups will be invited for campus tours. We've planned a UN birthday party with the state legislature during its session. We'll invite public school personnel. And, currently, we are in correspondence with our congressional delegation to submit a resolution in Congress memorializing the Centennial.

We have felt quite strongly that the respective disciplines within the University should plan a variety of programs and conferences, colloquia, symposiums, institutes, and so forth, utilizing scholars from our own University [and] from [other] states of the nation to assess the future roles of a university and to express [this] through its separate schools and colleges. Now, the primary aim of these conferences would be to provide an intellectual stimulation for the University community. To date the following units of the University are planning conferences or symposiums or other such meetings: The College of Agriculture, College of Education, College of Business, School of Nursing, School of Home Economics, General University Extension, The Mackay School of Mines, School of Medical Sciences and various departments in the College of Arts and Science.

We also felt that the University of Nevada and its faculty should plan to honor the state of Nevada, the community of Reno, the alumni, friends of the University, and the federal government, for their contribution to the well-being of the University and their role, really, in the great partnership in financing and developing this teaching and research institution. For example, to honor these people, a Centennial award—the University of Nevada Centennial Award—to be established by the Board of Regents (which *has* been established by the way) will be presented to selected alumni, friends, guests, federal officials and others at various ceremonies and special events starting this Centennial year.

We also felt that during the Centennial, or preceding it, that a program of publication and dissemination of the scholarly products of the Centennial celebration, of the matters of interest occurring during the year, the historical data pertaining to the University, will be encouraged. In other words, we feel that some of the great speakers we may have

and institutes we have—for example, some of the major publications already issued, include the history of the College of Engineering, a short history of the University of Nevada Library, a history of the College of Education, the history of the University of Nevada Summer School, [the] history of the College of Agriculture, history of the Mackay School of Mines, and *possibly* histories of the Orvis School of Nursing, Medicine, Student Affairs and General University Extension.

The ones we have already, that have been completed [are] the history of the College of Engineering, the Libraries, the College of Education, and the summer school. Those already have been completed. Dr. Hulse's [history] will be out shortly. College of Ag is going to have their history shortly and the School of Mines is working on theirs. They're still in the process of research.

We have appointed a subcommittee of the Centennial Committee, chaired by Dr. Laird, Dr. Elliott, and Dr. Brown, whose responsibilities are twofold. One, to develop a Centennial shelf of books. Two, to develop some policy guidelines in regards to the kinds of proceedings that we would like to recapture, and perhaps publish for whatever reason. In both of these instances, they will work through the University of Nevada Press Advisory Board. The Centennial shelf of books will be selected, published, and publicized as determined by the advisory board of the University Press. Such things as the history of the state of Nevada by Elliott, and history of the University of Nevada by Hulse, and maybe other books, maybe by [Walter] Van Tilburg Clark, or whatever, it will be a shelf of books, for sale for a certain [price].

We have planned extensively that the University would be prominently displayed throughout the year by means of numerous

exhibits here and elsewhere, with an approved and enhanced physical appearance including at least one imaginative major improvement which would attract the attention of visitors to the campus. Subcommittees have now been appointed to survey campus buildings and grounds for a University-wide campus clean-up. A floral design near the stadium is in the process of consideration—will be developed, hopefully. Colleges, schools, and departments [are] requested [to] design and install a variety of exhibits and displays. The UNR Music Department has been commissioned to screen selected Centennial songs. The Home Economics Department will design and make a Centennial Flag. Professor Craig Sheppard has been commissioned by the committee [to depict] ten scenes of the University's history, by decades. They'll be black and white and sold in a portfolio similar to [Robert] Caples'.

Ruth G. Hiltz: Now, he has retired, I believe. But he was commissioned to do this?

That's right, or *will* be commissioned.

In addition, the Audio Visual Aids Department is designing a historical exhibit for presentation at the Nevada State Fair, [the] Reno Airport, and then for exhibits and tours statewide. Miss Linda Loeffler has already made a sketch, and it's a beautiful thing, and it'll be displayed first of all at the Nevada State Fair, from September the 4th through September the 8th of this year. Then upon completion of the Nevada State Fair, we will install it at the airport for a certain length of time, and then periodically this exhibit will be taken throughout the state along with the statewide program which I'll explain in a minute.

One of the major goals and objectives of our committee was that the Centennial celebration, the entire occasion, should

strengthen the bonds that link the faculty and alumni and student body into a more cohesive unit for the betterment of the University. That is one of our major goals. For example, some of the major student activities will include an extra expanded lecture series, a musical production, a Centennial Mackay Week, Arts Festival, Homecoming, and the possibility of a student international conference. All of the traditional events and activities will evolve around the Centennial theme. A student escort service is being planned to assist the Centennial committee to meet and escort distinguished visitors to the campus. The University of Nevada *Sagebrush* will, hopefully, produce a Centennial edition and provide publicity and general news coverage throughout the year.

The Alumni Association has planned a variety of Centennial programs scheduled throughout the year. Major activities will include strong emphasis upon fund raising for the restoration of Morrill Hall. They also plan an alumni homecoming week, publication of memorable and humorous incidents, by decades, of the alumni. It will be collated, edited and sold for a nominal amount of money. Also, sale of Stewart Hall bricks as souvenirs. They're planning the sale of a liquor decanter as a souvenir, with Morrill Hall on the decanter. They plan to participate in Mackay Week and on what we call the Legislature-Government day.

I would like to say that the single dominant characteristic of the Centennial observance will be [a] focus upon excellence. A quality program. To carry out this principle of quality being developed, [we started] in April of '73 as I mentioned. So, that briefly, [is] the basic general outline of what we wanted to do, and plan, and so forth.

Starting in February of this year, looking towards October 12, 1974, which is the birthday of the University, we plan to release

the Centennial stationery. We have the seal for UNR publications. For example, the seal is in central services, and all material leaving the campus will have the seal on it, and on envelopes. We will have the seal for the University of Nevada, Reno, representative groups, primarily students, such as, intercollegiate athletics, the rodeo club, the ROTC department, the debate squad, University Singers, the band and similar organizations that are in an interscholastic kind of competition. We will, hopefully, have some sort of symbol that they'd wear on their equipment or their clothes during the year to sort of publicize the Centennial. Might be patches on shoulders, might be decals on football helmets or things of that nature.

We also have a cancellation die-hub in central services for all first-class mail leaves this campus. The Centennial seal, as a postage [cancellation], so you see this seal every time [mail] goes off campus.

As I mentioned to you, we have commissioned Craig Sheppard for ten historical sketches, black and white. That will possibly be completed in June. The committee has not decided as yet, but I'm certain that they will be presented to the University of Nevada (the originals). We'll have reproduction rights, and we will then have these prints available in a sort of a portfolio for anyone who so wishes to purchase them.

We have reviewed a numerous number of advertising specialty items such as bumper stickers, decals, etc. They're in the process now, because we hope to have them available for people who can purchase them, put them on their bumpers or windows and so forth and so forth.

We also have discussed a centennial die-hub for the Reno post office. Now, this particular die-hub would be in the central office in Reno. And as I understand from the Reno post office, more than 110,000

pieces of mail will carry the Centennial seal or reference to the University of Nevada Centennial.

We hope, in May, that we will review the historical slides that are being developed by the Audio Visual Aids Department. We hope to have a master set and perhaps four duplicate sets for use. Probably we should have one for use on campus, one that'll go on traveling exhibits, and two that can be farmed out or mailed out or used in the general community.

A few months ago, we, through our administrative subcommittee, contacted the management of Donrey Advertising in regards to the use of billboards. They have indicated to us that they will provide ten to twelve billboards, at cost, which means that the only thing we'll have to pay for are the labor costs and the paper. We'll have two billboards in the city of Reno and Sparks and ten would be located throughout the outlying communities.

All publications on the University campus will carry some sort of reference to the UNR Centennial. For example, the calendar, the catalog, all publications that emanate from the University will have some reference to the Centennial, carrying the seal and symbol.

In July of this year, through the efforts of the Greater Reno Chamber of Commerce, a special ground display saluting University of Nevada Centennial will be [presented]—July the 4th, by fireworks in our stadium.

Now, we have contacted various firms and organizations in the Reno-Sparks community, in an attempt to publicize the Centennial by asking them to use their various marquees for publicizing the Centennial. For example, the Centennial Coliseum has agreed to do this, the Pioneer Auditorium, Park Lane, Ski Hut, K-Mart. We've contacted Reno and Sparks High Schools, if they would sort of publicize it

on their marquees. The Reno Airport will have an exhibit there, the Chamber of Commerce will have various hotels and motels in the city have reference to the Centennial in some way. We hope to have bumper stickers or something on University automobiles, on taxis, perhaps buses. Summer session news for the summer will carry publicity, etc.

Now, in August of 1974, or in September of 1974, we don't know what month, we're in the process of contracting—well, we have all ready contacted the congressional delegation, asking them to present a resolution in the halls of congress, sort of publicizing the University of Nevada and its Centennial year. And they have both agreed, fine, glad to do it, so Professor Hulse has written up a sort of a historical sketch of the University and its relationship to congress and its contributions, and so forth. And it will be edited by the senators and the congressional delegation and we probably will hear from them soon, in regards to what month they'll have the presentation. If that occurs, the Alumni Association is thinking in terms of having an alumni conference in the city of Washington, D. C., inviting all the various alumni within that area to be there in some special ceremony, such as, maybe, a breakfast or luncheon, where we have the congressional delegation there, perhaps delegates from the University of Nevada and the system to be there. And the Alumni Association, twill] just have a little program in honor of the resolution, with a lot of advance publicity, hopefully, so that we can generate more publicity.

We hope—as I mentioned earlier—to have the campus cleanup started in August, for the two months of August and September. A special committee is working on this. And we hope that it'll be a volunteer kind of thing that we can have everybody contribute in some way, work Out, and clean up the campus

and make it much more beautiful and more presentable and attractive for the opening convocation in October. We have received excellent support from the Physical Plant, Mr. Pine's office. Buildings and Grounds [is] already building signs for all the buildings. And they hope to have them all completed and every building will have a designated sign, indicating what building it is. There are over sixty buildings—.

We hope to start selling the Stewart Hall bricks in August or September. Depends, of course, when or if Stewart Hall is torn down. They're looking for somebody to tear it down, and once that's done, the bricks will be stored. One of the members of the alumni committee [will] store it in back of her house. And then [the] process comes in: how do you glaze the bricks and stamp the seal on it? You know, that sort of thing. [We could] seal 'em for bookends or paper weights and things of that nature.

Of course, [as] I said, the exhibit at the Nevada State fair will be from September the 4th through the 8th. It'll be in three parts, folded, about six feet high, four feet wide, stands up.

You fold it up and you can pack it off and [show it around the state]. One of the panels'll have the beginning of the University in Elko and it'll have various kinds of pictures [in] the old fashioned type of frame, reflective of that era, so to speak. Then, in the center panel would be the University of Nevada as it is today. All this will have a Plexiglas—it'll have a transparency with lights on the back. It'll show the state of Nevada in the center panel, show where the University started, the community colleges, the DRI, UNLV, UNR, how it grew and so forth. Then, the other panel will be a projection of the University for the future, sort of.

In addition to that (and this hasn't been confirmed as yet) our subcommittee has

recommended to the president that on September 13, of this year, the regularly scheduled date of the Board of Regents meeting, that we have the governor of the state of Nevada formally present in person a proclamation for the University of Nevada Centennial year. We hope to have various groups of people there—administrators, alumni, student representatives, the regents, and so forth, with the news media in attendance. The idea is that it'll probably be a luncheon of some kind, so the governor will make a formal presentation. The chairman of the Board of Regents would respond and the chancellor and then the president of the University of Nevada, Reno. It'll be sort of a kick off kind of thing for the governor's proclamation.

In August and September we have a variety of publicity things to sort of generate publicity. We hope to have some radio and TV spots starting around that time. And, of course, the local newspapers, hopefully, will carry various kinds of programs and events to build up for October the 12th.

We have contacted the Nevada Highway Department— oh, three or four months ago; they have agreed to put highway signs on Interstate 80 [at] 395, and Sierra and Center Streets. The signs are the standard size, say *University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, Exit*. Then below they'll have it say, *University of Nevada Centennial, 1874-1974*. That'll be on Interstate 80, east and west, on 395 going south. [There'll] be nothing coming north on 395; it's too cluttered.

We hope to have a code-a-phone. We'll have a telephone number that'll be in the newspapers, and on television, and radio, that if any person desiring to know what activities or events are planned for that day, or for that week, or for that month, we will have it on tape and then when you dial it, it will explain

exactly what's going on, for the day, for the week, and for the month.

One very, very interesting thing. Before I go any further, I would like to say that the cooperation and the interest that we have received has been very good from people outside the community—I mean outside the University community, has been excellent. They have done everything they could, in many instances realizing we have a lack of funds, they've gone out of their way, so to speak, to help us. For example, we hope to have various Centennial programs. Sierra Pacific Power [Company] and Nevada Bell, in their monthly statements to their customers, will have a little insert to publicize the various events for the year, for the week, or whatever. The Chamber of Commerce has agreed to have various inserts in their literature when they distribute it. Also, we hope to have some feature articles in the *Entertainment Guide*, for example.

And then, somewhere in September, possibly through Howard Rosenberg, and perhaps the ASUN film series, we hope to show a variety of old movies that were [filmed], on this campus. You realize there've been eight, ten, or more movies made on this campus. And Professor Rosenberg said that he can get those, and he can have them shown. Sort of an added little thing.

Of course, this is all building up for October the 12th, which is the opening convocation. We are conscious of the fact that we can't just build up publicity for October and then let it slide down. We're trying to maintain a steady flow for the year. The Alumni [Association] and Associated Students plan a Homecoming Week from October the 7th to the 12th. They'll have the normal, traditional things—the Wolves Frolic, a golf game, a dance, and alumni celebration, and then a football game, and so forth.

Of course, we'll have the opening convocation on the 12th. We are in the process now of developing the processional, the recessional, and the program itself. Just briefly, we hope to invite, as I've mentioned, for the presidential party we've planned to invite people like the governor and senators and the congressmen and the mayor of Reno, mayor of Carson and also Sparks. We'll have an honorary degree member or Centennial award member. We'll probably have a distinguished speaker there. We'll have the chancellor and his staff, the executive officers of the community college, DRI and UNLV, student representatives, alumni representatives. We also plan to invite delegates from learned societies and professional associations, from other universities and colleges. We hope to invite, too, former governors, senators, congressmen, regents, distinguished Nevadans, honorary degree members, back to the campus. We hope to invite former alumni presidents, former ASUN presidents, executive vice presidents, AWS presidents. We hope to also invite back the Herz gold medal winners. The ROTC winners, governors medal winners, the members of the athletic hall of fame. We'll have special guests there too; former UNR presidents, for example, former members of the Board of Regents, faculty representatives from the various other members of the system.

We've designated the entering 1974 fall semester freshmen as the New Century class. There are going to be around 1500 of 'em, supposedly. And now we will probably either appoint, or have appointed, or have special elections, to have say, eight representatives to march in the processional. Now, we'll have the processional and at the tail end of the processional when everybody has been seated, then we'll have introductory remarks by the chairman, and then we will have a presentation of the Centennial flag. They'll

march from Morrill Hall up to the stand. The flag will be carried by somebody from the ROTC department. On the right side of the flag, facing the stand, will be the Professor of Military Science; on the left hand side will be the, hopefully (we haven't invited him yet) will be the mayor of the city of Elko. And behind them will be the eight members of the new freshman class. The mayor of the city of Elko will present the Centennial flag to the president of the University of Nevada, Reno. They'll take it around and then they'll post it and then they get on the stand. During this time we may play the new Centennial song. There's going to be a competitive thing. There'll be three songs selected and presented to the committee and we'll select on of the three.

Then, of course, there will be a symposium October 15 through the 17th, by the Hilliard committee, on some aspect of higher education. They'll have some distinguished scholars and speakers at this symposium. We hope to dedicate a building, probably the PE building, during this month. Then, we have ideas to have a Nevada Day float. The students and the classified people can put it together. The College of Education C.A.P.S. [Counseling and Guidance Personnel Services] will have a tour of their facility.

Scheduled during this month will be the University of Nevada Theatre, Nevada Repertoire Group, a history— 100 years of theatre in Nevada—on three weekends in October and November.

We have been in contact with the *Nevada Magazine* management. They have indicated to us that they [will] cooperate and have at least half or more of the *Nevada Magazine* on the University of Nevada Centennial. Now, the [Newspaper] supplement that I originally told you about will be released on October the 12th, the day of the opening convocation.

In October, we hope to start some tours. I forgot to tell you, but we do plan to have a what we call a Centennial headquarters as a visitors center. And, hopefully, we will have our tours from there—we'll have these tours on open invitation and certain times of day, and we'll have our various student service groups to assist us in this.

Now, in November, we have a scheduled Home Economics lecture. The College of Education, C.A.P.S. Department, will try to get the Nevada Personnel and Guidance Association Convention. And in November we will plan our tourist exhibit, traveling exhibit. We have received excellent cooperation and support from the Nevada National Guard, who'll allow us to use their equipment to take various exhibits and displays throughout the state. They will provide the driver (and they'll also conduct their own recruiting program at the same time that we have programs in the various communities in the state). The program is not finalized as yet, but it'll include a skit by the Drama Department, [and] we'll have a Centennial speaker. This is all going to be managed and directed by the General University Extension. Various programs will be presented by others than the GUE. We will hope to have, as I say, a drama presentation; we'll have the slides; we'll have the paintings or sketches by Sheppard; we hope to have a Centennial speaker; we hope to have the exhibit (that I mentioned previously from the airport). Once a month, from November through May, we'll be visiting these various [Nevada] communities. In addition to that, if we're fortunate, we will have the Centennial song team [to] go with this group. Now, these traveling exhibits will be in November, December, January, February, March, April, and May.

In February of '75, we hope to have a University of Nevada birthday party in Carson

City. We hope to have a joint meeting of the legislature where we'll bring out a big cake and cut it, and have some ceremonies attached to that. Also, in February, the Home Economics lecture, [and] students will have their Winter Carnival here. Under publicity, we'll still have our code-a-phone messages, our radio and TV spots, insert in Chamber of Commerce literature, entertainment guides, calendar, local newspapers, and campus tours, and so forth. So all this publicity will go each month.

In March, we plan a UNR Day by the city of Reno. There'll be a resolution by the mayor and a program will be developed in sufficient time. One interesting thing: the reason we want to have UNR Charter Day and UN Day is [that] March the 7th is a very significant day. March the 7th, Governor Bradley, in 1873, signed a bill that placed the University of Nevada in Elko. It was the beginning of the University of Nevada—Elko. A[nother] very interesting thing, on March the 7th in 1883, Governor Adams signed a bill that brought the University of Nevada to the Reno campus. So, March the 7th is a very significant day.

On March the 5th the legislature will be asked, hopefully, to [come] to the campus for some tours and a little program. In April we have Mackay Week which will be an all-encompassing thing. We hope to involve both the University community, the students, the alumni, and the general community. Hopefully, we can have exhibits and displays in every department. Hopefully, we can involve students who will have their programs. The alumni plan to have some kind of a program, hopefully. We can have, say, the engineers day or Arts Festival week—all this combined in one huge massive week, or more than a week, because the students feel that Mackay Week is their time, for their celebrations for the University of Nevada, *Reno*, not the University of Nevada.

The students felt quite strongly that Mackay Week should be a time to focus on and emphasize the University of Nevada and *their* campus.

And, as I mentioned before, they plan to have a very large Homecoming parade. They plan to invite back to the campus, during this time, the former stars and starlets of the various movies that were produced on this campus. They hope to have, as I mentioned earlier, a very outstanding personality, that's nationally, internationally known, to lead the parade, such as John Wayne. They ought to have a huge formal ball. They'll have a musical, plus their other activities. They haven't formalized or really worked out their program yet. In general, that's what it is.

Then we hope to have other departments, colleges, and schools have exhibits and plays and that sort of thing. Plus, maybe, we could combine some of the many activities of the year into one week; Engineers Day and that sort of thing—has just been in the formative stage—because it's a whole year ahead of us.

Now, in May we'll have our commencement convocation, which will be the end of the Centennial, which will also be a very important event. And it has been suggested that after the commencement convocation we have a formal or costume dance to sort of finalize the Centennial year.

Now, we have asked various colleges and schools and departments to submit programs to be included on the calendar of events. Many of them have ideas and plans [but] they have not presented their various programs [for] the Centennial calendar to make it official. For example, the College of Education is planning some audio visual materials for TV and statewide meetings. They plan to have the dean of the college to go out on a tour of the state. They plan to have displays and exhibits, radio tapes and news articles and various films

to be shown during Mackay Week celebration honoring distinguished Nevada educators. A tea to honor selected educators—they might honor some various educators some time during the year. College of Engineering—they want to compile and publish a list of engineering graduates, have a student paper contest on a theme, and feature articles of University of Nevada, Reno, engineering students [in] statewide publicity. They plan to have some display cabinets in the Scrugham Engineering Building.

Even Dean [Charles V.] Wells suggested that the faculty wear academic garb on campus for a special week, and on special occasions in the Reno downtown area.

The Admissions and Registrars Office—all the publications [are] to bear the seal and symbol, including the stationery, [and] possibly an overrun of the catalogue as it is a Centennial issue. Student Services plan an old-fashioned picnic for the community, old cars, with old-time dress reflecting historical dates of the University of Nevada, have a banjo band, a barber shop quartet, and so forth.

Home Economics—they want to have some events for alumni and alumnae prior to 1940, and then '40 to '49, '50 to '59 and so forth. College of Ag—they plan TV [and] radio news regarding the college, [to] participate in the general university exhibit, [f to] create a floral design of the seal, create a Nevada agricultural hail of fame with a plaque, build a mobile unit or a trailer unit, sale of the UN Centennial seal with College of Ag design, key chains, paper weights and other souvenirs.

These plans that they've submitted, are they waiting for financing before they implement them?

Yes. That's right. That's right.

Now, the Library said they'd like to have a historical library scene in the lobby, staff to wear period costumes at special events, [a] formal or costume dance for [the] general public, [and a] University oriented display for the Circulation [Department]. In Nursing—the former deans and outstanding personalities for lectures (and they want to set up a theme). Social Services and Corrections—they want to work with Washoe County Medical program in new concepts of crisis teams to work with dying patients and family. Music Department—were trying to think if we can have some composition by Dr. Ronald Williams, some sort of a musical presentation of his works. The Mackay School of Mines—they're going to set up a conference of mineral industry, nationally informed experts to come here on a two, three day conference. Medical School—they're in the process of writing a history of medicine in Nevada. They'd like to raise some money for two chairs in Medical Science. They're thinking in terms of a museum in Virginia City. Perhaps have some seminars and some conferences. College of Business has in mind a special issue in *Nevada Business Review*. They want to set up a tax institute with the IRS, State Bar, CPA society. They'll have some speakers for small business workshops, small business management, follow-up conference on physical distribution, we call it. A series of articles [on the] development of Nevada's business over 100 years, special masthead on each issue with the centennial seal. And a special issue of the *Review* as written in 1875. (You know, their publication.)

Now, those are the academic community programs. We've asked these people to think in terms of formalizing this and presenting it to the committee for formal acceptance and approval on the calendar of events so it'd be scheduled. You see? These are just the

things they have *mentioned*, but they have not submitted any request to be placed on the calendar of events.

Now, the community programs—the community program subcommittee have come up with some ideas such as a tree planting in Reno by the Superintendent of Parks. In other words, they would plant a tree somewhere in the parks in the Reno-Sparks area. They recommended a flag pageant that takes about forty minutes. It's the presentation of the flags of the United States. It's a very, very impressive ceremony. They have indicated that they have petitioned the governor to include the Centennial in his message to the legislature.

There are many community organizations that have been contacted and many of them agreed to do some sort of program or event or project, but they want the Centennial committee to say. "Well, we'll do something. What do you want us to do?"

Oh. They want a suggestion.

Yeah. Like give a pint of blood. An eye bank by the Lions Club. A slides and film showing. Foreign exchange students. Citizens tour of the campus, and of course, I've mentioned UN Day by the Chamber of Commerce. We'll have a tour, luncheon and a seminar. Something like a Centennial poster [or] essay contest in the local schools. Special tree planting on Arbor Day. A special Centennial marquee by the city of Reno. Historical marker in Elko, where the school was first established. They recommended a Centennial art show by the University of Nevada, Reno, on the walkway between Bell telephone building and the Truckee River. Some tree planting on the UNR campus by the 4-H clubs.

Anything that happens could be labeled Centennial?

That's right.

General University Extension [plans] statewide visitations, slides and film strips, as I mentioned, with narration, traveling [statewide]. We'll spend about two days in each community. We'll have historical slides and a Centennial song team. They'll continue to award the educational service award. They'll have weekend seminars [such as] women in the 20th Century, [using] Centennial speakers, displays and printed material, and so forth. The alumni program, as I mentioned—a souvenir liquor decanter, Stewart Hall bricks. They also have some ideas about updating the UNR alumni directory.

Classified employees programs—a brochure of classified employees, an honor day of former and present employees, and office decorations of the Centennial year. So that, in a very brief way, is the Centennial.

The committee feels that [the] result of the Centennial celebration, with emphasis upon the historical, [will be] to honor the past, to look at the present, and project the future. They hope by having a Centennial calendar of events, they would bring out things where the University of Nevada made its contribution to the people of the state and to the nation, and that in these trying times, the University of Nevada will, as a result of the Centennial, pull together to project for the future and set a goal for the next five, ten, twenty, hundred years. That the results of the Centennial may prove to be a focal point upon which to focus on the future.

Now, it is a community-wide, it is a statewide program and project that—. Our problem is one of financing. As of today, we have \$7,000, four thousand of which is restricted and three thousand unrestricted. I've submitted a budget to the President, hopefully, that maybe from individual sources or other sources and foundations perhaps we

might get some money to really put on the program we think is a quality program. That is the problem we have right now.

I presented a petition to the Nevada State Council of the Arts. I received \$2,000, of which \$2,000 had to be matched by the University. So we have \$4,000 for music, art, and drama projects. In fact, that's where the money's going to go—for the Sheppard sketches, for the Centennial song, and for the design for the exhibit for the fair. We hope to present additional requests to the Nevada State Council of the Arts for a musical composition or presentation by Ron Williams, traveling funds for the Centennial song team, and a sufficient amount of funds [so] we could reproduce the Sheppard sketches for sale. The ten sketches, probably they'll be by 12 by 18 [inches]. Now, one of the things that we've decided upon and agreed upon in our subcommittee, and our committee, I'm sure, will approve it, [and] that is that we have struggled for quite some time on souvenirs of the Centennial. (We went through the normal types of key rings and ash trays and mugs and all the different things—.) But we've come up with an idea of taking the ten historical sketches by Sheppard, reduce them down to about eight by five or less, in packets of ten, present it to people free at various ceremonies and banquets and so forth, as a souvenir. They could also be sold in a retail outlet, in the bookstore. [There] might be postcard use. In that way, you see, we wouldn't have to purchase any souvenirs. These would be much more meaningful. The president has been very optimistic about money for the committee, and I've been optimistic, myself, and I think somewhere along the line we'll have some money. How much we hope to have we don't know. We'll have a Centennial of some kind.

[Laughing] After going through all of this, many of these things are just a lot of hard work

and leg work. To have a budget that includes a lot of things, invitations, speakers and costs and meals and printing—publishing you need—it's an expensive thing.

Did you want to name any of the people who are working with you, chairmen or members of the various committees, the subcommittees?

Well, I'm the chairman, as you know. Mrs. Virginia Phillips—she's a housewife and alumnae; Mr. Hans Wolfe, vice-president of the First National Bank, representing the alumni; Mr. Clark Santini, also alumni. He's on the gaming commission. And Mr. Jack McAuliffe, he's currently an attorney, alumnus, and former president of the Alumni Association. Now, the faculty members that're on are Dr. Eleanor Bushnell, professor of political science; Dr. Russell Elliott, professor of history; Dr. Larry Larsen, professor of economics; Dr. Charles Seufferle, associate dean and professor in the College of Agriculture. The three students Tom Mayer, who is now the student body president, Miss Jeanette Ragland, and Marianne Millard. That was the original committee. We've added four staff emeriti—Dr. Ralph Irwin, Dr. Charlton Laird, Dr. Everett Harris, and Dr. Harold Brown. And then, for our classified representatives, we have Madge Tillim and, of course, my secretary, Pat Fladager. She's an ex-officio member and takes care of all the minutes and all that sort of thing.

Now, on the subcommittees—I'm chairman of the administrative subcommittee, and people on that committee [are]: Ed Olsen, President Anderson, Ed Pine, Bob Kersey, Pat Fladager, and Ron Smith, director of the convention center of the Chamber of Commerce.

Then for the academic community subcommittee, we have Charles Seufferle,

the chairman; Russ Elliott, Eleanor Bushnell, Laird, Harris, and Brown. For the alumni subcommittee, Mrs. Phillips is the chairman; Jack McAuliffe, Larry Struve, who's the current president, and Paul Havas, former president, and myself. Now, the community program subcommittee, Hans Wolfe is the chairman, Clark Santini is a member, then we have Earl Wooster, Paul Leonard, and Judd Allen. The students subcommittee is: Tom Mayer is chairman, Marianne Millard, Dr. Larry Larsen, Dean Roberta Barnes, and then, of course, we had Terry Reynolds, as the other person. He's graduating now. Probably have another one appointed. Now, the classified people: Pat Fladager is the chairman. We have Madge Tillim and I forget now the three other members.

Well, one of the interesting things that came out of the meeting with the Academic Council was a suggestion made to me to consider the possibility of having a Centennial marathon, between Reno and Las Vegas, involving both campuses. I went to Jack Cook and discussed the idea with him. He thought it was an excellent idea, and he said he would consult with his athletes. They had a meeting and said they'd all agreed, unanimously, it was an excellent idea, and glad to participate. So then I presented the idea to the administrative subcommittee. We discussed it at great length and we agreed that it would have, and does have, tremendous potential. And we've agreed that this ought to be a part of the overall function of the Centennial. Now, the idea is that Jack Cook—he's a track coach—he'll have ten runners. He'll be in the University van and we'll have the runners leave Reno. This'll be before October 12th—before the opening convocation. The idea is that they'll have a baton and inserted within the baton will be a scroll, very beautifully done—the scroll will be an invitation from the president of the

University of Nevada, Reno, to the president of University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and an invitation from the student body president here to the student body president in Las Vegas, to participate in the Centennial celebration.

Now, the ten runners will start—one runner will start, and each runner will have—there'll be five jerseys with the Centennial seal on the back, and they will run a certain number of miles, the baton will be passed from one runner to the other. The idea is that we'll have a small reception at most little towns along the way. We can't run on the federal highways, as I understand—I mean any interstate highway. So the plan is—we don't know which way to go, but we plan to go from here to Carson to Yerington to Hawthorne, somehow get into Fallon, I don't know how. The idea is that at each little town we will, hopefully, have the mayor and school system would come in and make a little reception with some publicity. And they'll run all the way to Hawthorne for one night. That's 130 miles; they think they can make that. They'll stay overnight there. Hopefully, we can get the community to support the kids, and from there they go to Tonopah for an overnight; from Tonopah to Beatty overnight, and from Beatty all the way into Las Vegas.

If this goes through, and it looks like it will, the ten runners' names will be stitched on the jerseys which they wore on the marathon. They'll take one or two that're in best condition and put their names on it for the display case.

We feel it's newsworthy. It'll hit all the newspapers across the state, and all over the country.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA:
A CENTENNIAL HISTORY
JAMES W. HULSE, AUTHOR

James W. Hulse: I'm James W. Hulse, professor of history here at the University, and as I understand it, you wanted me to talk today because I've been writing the centennial history of the University. At this point—May the 6th— the book is going through the presses in Carson City. All of the pages are made up, but we've seen about half of the signatures. That is, that much of it is through the press. I finished reading proof on the index last week, so that job is finally done.

I've been working on the centennial history of the University for about three and a half years, most of the time pretty regularly. Of course, the last six months hasn't been nearly as hectic because the basic writing and editorial work was done, and it's been in production for six months. So I'm relatively recently liberated from that project.

About ten years ago, Dr. Fred Anderson of the Board of Regents did ask then-President Charles Armstrong when we were going to get another [University) history. There may have been others on the Board of Regents who were also interested in getting the

centennial history because the old [Samuel B.] Doten history was then forty years out of date. Dr. Armstrong then called Russ Elliott in the History Department, asking him if there were anyone in the department who was willing to do it. Russ asked me if I would collaborate with him. I was then relatively new on the faculty, and I said yes, I would be very pleased to collaborate with Russ. And so we informally agreed that we would do the job, but I had to specify and he did, too, the projects that we then had underway had to be finished first.

Well, this satisfied Charles Armstrong, and presumably the regents. They did ask Russ for some kind of a budget, and he proposed what he thought it would cost. And the regents at their next meeting announced—and there was publicity in the paper to the effect—that they were setting aside a budget for this project. I've forgotten the amount, but it was two or three thousand dollars, I think.

But at any rate, the years went on. I finished a couple other projects in the interim. Russ was writing his big history of Nevada, and

we never got around to it until the late '60's. We talked again and Russ then said he didn't really want to do it. I regarded him as the senior member; he knows much more about Nevada history than I ever will. He didn't want to abandon the project without talking to me, but he did say that at this stage in his career there were other things that he'd rather do, such as a biography of William Stewart, and he asked me would I mind if he stepped out of the program. By that time, Charles Armstrong was gone. We both knew, though, that the project ought to be undertaken and finished before the Centennial.

Edd Miller then asked me if I would do it, and I agreed to do it if a budget were approved to give me some basic funds for travel and research. And I also stipulated that I would do it if I could be liberated from all the boards, committees, all the bureaucratic duties of which I'd had more than my share in the previous few years. I'd been on the University Senate for five and a half years. I was afraid I was about to become department chairman. I really do not like all that administrative nonsense, and I was running to some kind of committee meeting every afternoon. I was very frustrated. And so I made a bargain that I would do this if I could be liberated from all those things. I agreed to teach the full load, to handle all my normal load of graduate students, and so on. I didn't want any reduction in teaching load and I didn't want any compensation in addition to my salary. But I did want to be liberated from that kind of thing, because I'd become convinced that I was not effective on the University Senate, I was not effective on the Undergraduate Council or the Public Occasions Board, etc.

Well, Edd agreed that that was a reasonable arrangement. But about another two years elapsed from the time I proposed a budget for traveling until the money was actually

available. You see, between '63 or '64, when we first talked about this, and '68, the whole Las Vegas complex blossomed into a full-fledged university. I think we thought, when we talked about it in '63, that it was a story of one campus with a little branch down south, and DRI then didn't amount to much. It was clear when we looked at the project again in '68 (at least it was clear to me) that the system was much bigger, the whole story was much more complex. The Archives were in terrible shape, as you know, then. And so I needed a research assistant and a travel budget and a certain fund for typing, and so on. I did ask for those things.

Well, for some reason it took a long time—. The budget I drafted was something like \$7900. Neil Humphrey encouraged me to draft a budget that would be adequate. He said, "Don't have to come back to us two or three times." Well, I did propose a budget for \$7900—I could give you a copy of the budget if you want it, but now I forget the details. Over half of it was for a research assistant, two or three thousand dollars for travel, and a typing fund. Well, as it turned out, that budget was voted in the summer of 1970. The Board of Regents approved it from non-appropriated funds—I think it was August of '70. And I've had that fund to draw upon to meet some of these basic expenses since that time.

Lenore Kosso, Mrs. Eugene Kosso, was a graduate student in history, [and] was available for the research. She was very good and competent, and I put her to work partly in the Archives and partly interviewing some people around here who knew something about the history of the University. She put together some very useful notes. I worked from the notes, and I interviewed some people, too, but by and large, when she was working on the individual departments in the contemporary academic situation, I was digging back into the earlier materials.

I did write the early history first. I moved up towards the recent period, and I organized the book in such a way that you get a historic overview in the first half of the book. You get kind of a topical examination of academic departments and of the student affairs and of the regents in the second half of the book. So as I was writing the first part of it, the historic chronology, the political, legal, educational overviews, she [Lenore] was preparing the information for the second part. And then I would take the notes she had given me for the Department of English, let's say; I would look at the kind of material she had given me, I would talk to a few key people, research some of the early material, and write that section under the Department of English. So that's the way I worked.

I didn't really write the second part in a very systematic way. I wrote those departments first that I was able to write most effectively. Because I was teaching a full load, I would fly off to Las Vegas on those occasions for a Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, or whenever I could get two or three days together, and turn over my classes for examinations to a graduate assistant. Those proved to be very hectic times, because I would rush to Las Vegas on a Thursday as a rule, interview and do as much work as I could there on Thursday and Friday, then come back on a Saturday both to a pile of notes from Las Vegas and to a pile of examinations from my students. So there were very challenging times.

I had fun with the early part of the project, and I learned a lot about the institution. I did enjoy seeing the thing go together for the first two-thirds of it. But, as you probably know, a manuscript like this can be fun to start, when you're making the discoveries and when things are happening, then pretty tedious to polish up and to make the pieces fit. And the gaps that are hardest to fill are always those that get left until last.

So I began to worry about whether I'd make the deadline. In fact, some of my letters to Edd Miller, back in '68 and '69 say, "I can't guarantee that I can finish this thing in time for the Centennial unless we get going right away." I didn't want to start and commit a lot of my time and energy and money, until the administration and the regents showed that they had enough interest in what I was doing to provide a budget. I did also specify that I wanted to write a historian's history, and I wanted to do what I thought was a historical interpretation of the University, and that I did not expect to disregard any of the blemishes or flaws or problems that might be embarrassing. Now I think, basically, the University, or the view of the University is a favorable one, but I did try to look at some of the most difficult periods of the University history with the candid eye of a historian. Not everybody will agree with my selection and organization and interpretation of the facts, but at least they are mine. Nobody at any time ever tried to tell me that something was a sacred cow or that something shouldn't be done. I may make some people angry by what I've inserted or omitted, but at least I did it, and I take the responsibility for it.

I should say, the \$7900 budget, by the time I was mostly done, it became clear I didn't need that much money. On a couple of occasions I proposed either to turn it over to the press or to give it back to the Chancellor's office. Because I guess it cost—I'll make a quick guess—about \$5000 in terms of my travel and Lee's salary, some of the typing costs, and so on. But Bob Laxalt and Neil Humphrey both seemed to think that it was far more effective for me to keep this fund and to pay some of the additional Costs of production. So, much of the cost of editing, some of the cost of design, photographic things—I hadn't expected to pay the cost of the photography

preparation out of this budget, but I was able to do it. So, in effect, I estimated it too high and I still have six or seven hundred dollars in there, but it's my plan to pay some of the bills that the press now has.

And we may even put together some sort of little slide show, some slides that could be put together with a cassette tape and sent around the state as a way of talking about the hundred-year history of the University. That would not be related to the book but it might be a way that we can spend the money on behalf of the Centennial.

Now, in addition to that, of course, the regents did provide some money for a production budget—the cost of paper, putting it through the printing office in Carson City. It's quite an expensive job. As you know, book manufacture is an expensive business, and I probably cannot pay for much of that, although virtually all of the money ought to come back to the University Press or the University System in the form of sales. So this will not be a money making proposition, but I doubt if it would cost the University anything. It may be that some of the research costs that went into this project will not be recovered, but, still, some of that research material is now in the Archives so it's a continuing asset.

In effect, I think, we've done the job without substantial cost to the University. They didn't have my services on the University Senate or on some of those tedious committees, but I don't think my services there were missed. I think my work here will have been more tangible.

Well, you remind me that we do have something like 220 photographs or illustrations in the book, and you've asked how we found these photographs. Most of them we dug out of the University Archives here, and the Nevada Historical Society, or from Ed Olsen's office (the Office of Information) or from

the Office of Information in Las Vegas. And there were a few of them out of the Archives in Las Vegas, which was only in its infancy when we began. So, for the most part, I went to the obvious places to look for photographs and I turned up far more than I could use. So it was a matter of screening out a lot of marginal photographs or even some quite good ones that didn't illustrate the text. And I had trouble cutting it off at 200. We set as a target about 200 photographs, and I wound up with—I think it is—219. We just didn't want the book to get out of range in terms of cost of production and so we did settle for that. Ahmed Essa over in the English Department helped me select some. Nick Cady in the University Press has a very good eye, a very good sense about photographs. I'm really not very good at that kind of thing. In some cases when I found mediocre photographs or prints, they found better ones of the same or similar things, and so forth. Whatever good art work one finds in the book, the credit for that goes to someone else, I think. I did turn up some good photographs but many of them were turned up by other people. Only in a few cases did I have to write letters to individuals or did I make trips to people's homes for reference material.

One of the themes I have for the book is that the making of a university in an environment like Nevada was a difficult procedure. Nevada's not the most obvious place to look for a university because a university involves a quest for knowledge, it involves advanced training of students, it involves performing an academic or scholarly service to the world, rather than to a region. When the University was created as a political entity, those men who created it were not really thinking, in my opinion, of *a university* in the old-fashioned European sense of the word. They were thinking of a

college to meet the immediate needs of the mining and agricultural community of the Far West. The University was created as a result of the Morrill Land Grant Act to meet some specific technical needs of the frontier. To transform that collegiate idea into a university, where important research goes on, where sophisticated investigation can go on, whether or not it serves the needs of Nevada's economy, to make that transition from what I call the small college idea to the *university idea* was a major challenge. And that's part of the theme that I try to develop in the book.

I think from the perspective of 1973-74 that we're in a period of lull. The *university idea* grew and developed very rapidly in the '60's. There was more money available. A number of scholars did some rather remarkable things. (We've had some people trying to do the university job over the years, but by and large, they were few in number.) Up until the late '50's or early '60's, the state really didn't fund much university work. It didn't really encourage much of what I'm calling *the university* approach to scholarship until late '50's, into the '60's, when we began to get more national endowment money, when the state legislature provided sufficient money for library, for graduate student aid, for sabbatical leaves, the kind of resources and time instructors need to do real research and to reach out to the larger academic world.

Part of the theme of the book is that in many departments a breakthrough came in the late '50's or '60's, and we were able to do far more sophisticated academic work. The faculty was expanded to cover many more fields, not only on the undergraduate level but on the graduate level. And that's where one makes a distinction. A University Press was created, which is a sign that an institution is becoming *a university*. The Desert Research Institute began to do the kind of research work

of a very esoteric nature that one associates with a university as opposed to a college. Quite a number of scholars published with major university presses elsewhere. In other words, we got Onto the map, academically speaking, in the last fifteen years. Now, the plateau we reached about '70 or '71 seems to raise a question about whether we are to continue building toward a university or whether we're going to have to cut our services to the extent that we will be—as I think we were, essentially, twenty-five years ago—essentially a college.

It seems to me an irony that we've created a community college division now in the late '60's and early 70's— we've created a community college division to meet immediate practical needs in various parts of the state. That was a very good step in the right direction, I think. That *ought* to have liberated the Universities more nearly for what I'm calling *the university* work. That may well not be happening, because I'm afraid I detect a tendency by my colleagues at university level to compete with the community colleges for student enrollment. Somehow we are lowering academic standards, I think, on this campus and, I dare say, at Las Vegas. The academic standards seemed to be going up, they seemed to be doing quite well in the '50's and '60's. My own personal view is that we have reversed the trend.

What has happened, we've got ourselves into a numbers game, as we call it. We've got ourselves into a situation where you've got to have x-number of students to make a class. That seems to be the kind of argument we have to make to the legislature to get appropriations. And so now a class of fewer than ten students causes a lot more consternation than it used to do when we were much poorer because one worries about whether that will look bad when the

computer printout provides the information to the Chancellor's office and the legislature. I don't know what the answer is, but I worry about [it]. If we stop building the library, if we stop supporting graduate research as we have done this semester—that is, the graduate dean's office has no money at the moment for graduate faculty research—if we cut back on the number of graduate students whose education we can help to subsidize—and we have done that this year—if we reduce foreign language requirements in order to make some of our programs more appealing, we have stopped doing, in some measure, the work of *the university*. So I'm worried about the 1970's.

You haven't heard me say anything about University salaries. Although we don't get paid, I suppose, as well as many of us would like, I've never felt that that was as big a handicap as many of my colleagues have. It's possible for our salaries to keep going up, as they seem to have done, and for us to stop doing university work, anyway. You don't automatically assure you get university-quality work just by increasing the amount of remuneration for faculty members. There are other things equally as important—maybe more important—in measuring the university's work. And if you cut back the support for basic research, if you let the library coast, if you let the library purchases get into trouble as they were fifteen years ago, if you stop attracting the good graduate students to the campus, then you've stunted the development of *the university idea*. (I hope I'm making it clear what I mean by *the university idea*.) *The university* may include and incorporate colleges. It may include and incorporate technical training programs. But unless it transcends that, and explores the unknown, unless it does some of the very esoteric things that don't pay for themselves on the local level, it's not worthy of the name *university*.

I think there are some things we've done here that are remarkable in the last ten or twelve years. I've tried to identify some of them in the book. Certainly the Desert Research Institute work on atmospheric physics—it's splendid. I think it's to the credit of this University that we have on the campus one of the few men who can teach Old Norse and Old English, a very sophisticated, esoteric field of knowledge—Old Norse is not taught in very many universities across the country, yet we have a man here with the capability of doing it, and he has taught, on a couple of occasions, very good graduate students in that field. I'd say that's a strong plus.

The legislature has done this University good service over the years. In many cases it has often been far more conservative in the expenditure of money than we would like, but in some cases that had to be, I suppose. But in the last ten years—well, let me say during the 1960's—the legislature did quite well by this campus. It's done much better by the other branches of the system in the '70's. I think this campus has partly been affected by the more rapid growth of Las Vegas and the community colleges since 1971.

Ruth G. Hilts: You don't put all the blame on lack of money. Is it a definition of goals by the University itself that's necessary?

Well, it may well be. It seems to me you won't solve all the problems by giving us three times as much money. If the money problems were to disappear, I would still worry about whether we're moving in the direction of *a university*; that is, are we really making it possible for faculty, graduate students, and the intelligent undergraduate students who really want to learn new material rather than just relearning old material that's already known? Are we making that possible? That will not

automatically come about just by increasing the number of dollars. But if they make us count the students in a Russian history class in order to figure out whether the Russian history class can be taught—. I'd be the first to admit that you've got to have a bare minimum, but I would put that minimum at four or five rather than twelve or fifteen. If there are four or five well-motivated students who want to study something, a true university ought to try to find a person to help them. Now, we can't do it in everything. We can't do it in old Sanskrit. Now, if we've got a man who can handle his teaching load doing Old Norse as a bonus, or if we've got a person who can do something very sophisticated in music or physics in addition to teaching a number of bright students, then we shouldn't make him pull his weight on the basis of a twenty to one ratio. We shouldn't make him feel that he's got to have twenty full-time students and—.

My thought on this year's making of the president? Well, I'm not a member of the presidential selection committee and so I don't really know how they've operated. I think it's a very good thing that they've had several branches of the faculty represented, a student has been on there, a representative of classified people, the deans, an alumni—a broadly based committee. I think that's very useful.

It seems to me that they've made an extensive search. I must assume the procedures went well. I gather the president's name is to be announced to us in a couple of days. I met a couple of the candidates who came here, but I wouldn't have had anything to say about the person— if he or she were named today anyway, I suppose. I don't know that much about them.

Past presidential selections were interesting. By and large, the regents made the choice

on their own until the choosing of Charles Armstrong in 1958—yes, I think, the fall of '58. And I believe the presidential selection committee that looked for him did a good job, turned out a very good man. I think some of the presidential selections made before that were a bit unfortunate. And I think maybe when you look at the book you'll get an impression as to which ones.

By and large, the presidents that weren't important got passed over real quickly. Not every president has a picture in there. Some of the presidents were dismissed quite quickly, because, in my judgment, they did not have a long range impact on the history of the University. I think there was one very great president, if I can use that term, for this University. Joseph Edward Stubbs, who became president in 1894 and served for twenty years, I think, knew what *the university idea* was and tried to implement it under very harsh conditions. He came here to a little college of some 300 students, and it seems to me he did a great deal to make clear what a university ought to be. He was an articulate man. He was in the classics. There are a couple of quotations from his speeches that I like very much, that I put into the history, about what learning ought to be, and what the business of the University ought to be. He was a man who brought ethical convictions to his work. And he was willing to speak out on social issues that he thought were disturbing to the University community. He opposed gambling and prostitution in downtown Reno. So he had a range of learning and a commitment to an unfolding process that higher education ought to be. He was more than just an administrator. He was one who held goals out before the University community and the whole state in a remarkable way. So I would hope that the selection committee would have found, and the regents would have

chosen a man like Dr. Stubbs. Whether that happened—a man with a vision, yes; a man with a commitment to what higher education ought to be. Ask me five years from now whether we got the man [laughing].

Anyway, I think the process by which the president was selected was as good a one as could be devised in a university system. It's always possible for a committee to make a mistake, but this was a good committee. It would have been difficult to choose a better committee than that one. The people were excellent.

Relative to the University Centennial, I thought, three or four years ago when I was working on this project, that the Centennial year would be the golden opportunity to say to the state and to one another, what a university ought to be. I thought it would give us a chance to perform as an institution the kind of role that Dr. Stubbs tried to perform sixty years ago.

I became very frustrated along the way when no committee was organized; no committee—nothing got going for a very long time. As you know, this committee that's now operating, the UNR Centennial Committee, is only about a year old, or something, and I thought we should have been planning it three and four years ago. I felt, frankly, that Dr. Miller—Edd Miller—moved slowly in that, and I think the notion that we had three or four years ago was that somehow a large fund drive to meet some of the University's needs might be made to coincide with the [Centennial] here. Nothing really happened. A centennial committee did get organized about a year and a half ago, and I desired not to be on any committees. Edd Miller knew this. I might have consented to be on a centennial committee if you'd asked me, but I wasn't going to volunteer. And it would have been logical to try and help there. But

when the committee was appointed, I think the administration appointed four, and the faculty four, and the students four, and the alumni four—some such formula as that. I was not asked by any of these groups so I was most content. Sam Basta did ask me if I would be a consultant. Every once in a while, someone calls me up for some historical information. I've desired not to spend a lot of afternoons sitting around designing medallions and setting up schedules. I am disappointed that we haven't been able to do more to plan for the Centennial. I really don't know of anything very concrete that's going to happen in the fall—perhaps a symposium during Centennial Week, perhaps some tours going out through the state, but none of this has jelled, and here we are in May of '74. The University may well have missed an opportunity to do the kind of projecting of its higher self. I don't mean just projecting an image, but projecting an image of what a university ought to be. I'm afraid we're not prepared to do that very well.

We may have a lot of bands and hoopla around here in the fall. We may even have a good symposium. But the proof of the pudding is yet to come. I think a decision has been made—I gather a decision has been made—not to engage in any kind of fund raising except that the alumni have undertaken for the restoration of Morrill Hall. I hope that project succeeds. But even that, the last I heard, was having trouble getting off the ground.

It seems to me one of the dangers that a person who wants to be a scholar and who wants to make a contribution to *the university*—a person who wants to do that kind of work has several risks he must run here at Nevada, and a number of handicaps he has to face. First of all, there is a shortage of money that's axiomatic. That can be overcome

if a scholar really wants to do his job. I can find a way to do most of the work I want to get done because the books are here or can be had. Now maybe a physicist doesn't have the same. Maybe there are people in other departments who can't work as readily with little money as a historian. So I don't mean to say that everybody can work with little money. But another hazard that a scholar faces is the demands on his time by the committees [and] just the administrative structure. I don't think I'm pointing the finger only at the University of Nevada. I think this is part of this world in which we live. We're all forced to become administrators in order to get an income tax paid and our car licenses purchased, and all of these paper work things that clutter up our time and energy are distracting to what I'll call creative thought. They are destructive in the process.

I was afraid five to ten years ago that I was falling into a trap, being elected to all these committees and spending all my creative time sorting out the papers and making reports to people, and getting the jobs done. I don't mind working on the student papers, that's part of the work. I do mind shuffling around papers, up and down the administrative scale. And that kind of thing can trap a creative scholar and destroy him for creative work. I'm afraid it's happened to some of my colleagues here. It happens to all of us a little bit. What the University ought to provide is more time and [the] possibility for the person who wants to isolate himself and to do his Old Norse or his atmospheric physics or his European history—the time to do it. They did provide me with enough time to do this University history. I hope the result is worth the amount of my salary they invested in that project.

I've just been elected department chairman. I'm going to be department chairman in history next year. I'm afraid that

year is sort of lost. I'm going to be crippled as a creative scholar that year because I have to shuffle so many papers over there. I didn't want the job, but you really can't turn it down when your colleagues elect you to it, and when someone else has had more than his share of the burden. So I'll do it. I'll grit my teeth for a couple of years and be department chairman and hope I come out of that experience with enough of my vitality left—I've got precious little creative juice in me, but whatever of that juice and vitality there is I hope is intact a couple of years hence. But I pity these people who—some people like it; if they want to do it that's fine, but I pity these people who really don't want to do it but who get caught in some kind of a paper work situation year after year after year, who do a fine service for the rest of us and for the students, but who don't have a chance to work on what it is academically they really want to do.

A small university can be as complicated to administer as a big one, and so good people sometimes get trapped in that maze. How does the university figure out a way to protect someone who might do a scholarly job for the larger academic world? How do you keep him off the university senate if he doesn't want to go there? I guess a person can always say no. If you say no often enough. Now, I said no ninety percent of the time when I was on this project, but I had a reason for it. If one says no too often he gets to be regarded as an old crank or uninterested or uncooperative. I've felt myself, in the last three or four months, slipping back into this business of running to some kind of a meeting all too often.

You speak of the scholar as artist.

I see no great distinction between a scholar and an artist.

Well, they're the same kind of person, creative person. As long as his position in this world is secure and respected, fine. But what about the ideas that are current, not just here but all across the country, that university professors have to measure up to some sort of productivity schedule? The old attitudes toward tenure are being questioned. How do you relate to this?

Well, it's hard to keep the human intellect, that creative germ we talked about, alive. There's no way to do it by legislation. There are probably a lot of ways you can kill it. I can see a lot of threats to it. I don't think there's artificially any way you can keep it alive. The person who has the possibility of doing good literary criticism or good history or good physics has somehow got to be self-motivated. He's got to be protected from outside interference, the most pernicious kinds of political interference, and that's what tenure does. But tenure won't guarantee anything. It seems to me a tenure system works best if the members of the academic community itself will police their own ranks. Somehow, we've got an obligation in the history department if a person becomes useless to get rid of him. But it's *we* who should do it. His professional peers should do it. And then we may not always do it well, sometimes we do it quite badly, but we are likely to do it on a much sounder basis than a board of regents or a legislature or a president.

Now, maybe they should prod us to do a better job. They shouldn't assume the job at some other level or you've created the instrument for political interference. There are other things that could happen, too, that I think would be bad. I personally feel that the trade union mentality, if it takes over in the university community as a substitute for tenure or an addition to tenure, can be very bad. I do not like the movement toward

unionization which seems to have a small start in some colleges. There are advocates of unionization, collective bargaining, here. I don't see collective bargaining as being a very good protection for the kind of creative spark I'm talking about. I see collective bargaining as a good protection for the job, for my job security, but I don't think you need that kind of job security in *the university*. I don't think you need it in the University of Nevada or in the ideal university. Not in my view. The University of Nevada ought to be working toward that idea. And, of course, that's what I've been saying all along.

In the National Society of Professors [there] seems to me a greater threat, potentially, to my academic freedom than the regents have been. The regents, over the years, have been doing good and bad things relative to academic freedom. I think they've made some mistakes, but I think the regents of the last fifteen years or so have by and large—there are some exceptions—stood up for the principle of academic freedom quite well. I can see the possibility of a National Society of Professors, if it became the bargaining agent, telling a professor, "You shall not teach this, or you shall not assume this overload on behalf of the students because it violates work guidelines." That possibility exists and that would be a serious restriction on *the university*.

Well, maybe I should make the point that Harold Jacobsen, three or four months ago—sometime last winter—made a statement to the effect that he thought tenure was bad [and] ought to be severely modified, tenure might well protect deadwood in the University. And on the occasion of that statement in the press (and he made a similar statement on television) I wrote him a letter. And you'd be welcome to have a copy of it if you want it, although I'm not publicizing it.

I didn't want to publish it, but I did send the letter to him and to each member of the Board of Regents, and to the president and dean and department chairman. In effect, I said that I'm not convinced there's a great deal of deadwood in the University community. If there is deadwood, it's not very conspicuous. There is some, obviously, and tenure may be protective, but I have a fear that if you eliminate tenure, or greatly reduce the protection it affords to creative young people, you're going to increase the amount of deadwood. Because what the elimination of tenure will do will be to stimulate unionization, collective bargaining, and under a system like that, I think it would be much more difficult to get rid of deadwood. I think deadwood would not be eliminated in the alternative situation, in the collective bargaining format. We may have some deadwood around here, but it would get even worse if that trade union mentality becomes operative.

I'll try a brief conclusion. I like my job very much. This is a great kind of thing to be doing. We try to build a university in a place that is probably lukewarm to the kind of university idea that I talked about. But it's a splendid undertaking, and what I want most now from the University and in my own life, I suppose, is to have a block of time to get back into European history, to do the kind of digging and exploring in those fields of history that are of particular interest to me.

WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC BOARD *ANNE HOWARD, CHAIRMAN*

Anne Howard: I am Anne Howard, chairman of the Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Board, which is a fairly young board that hasn't existed for very long at all. As a matter of fact, we're sort of half of a board that was suggested by the committee which reviewed athletics at the University of Nevada last year.* That committee came up with a report which suggested that the ideal way to run our two athletic programs was to have a single board, which would be made up in a very careful fashion to represent students, faculty, alumni, and others, some with special influences and others without. However, for some reason which I don't quite understand and which I don't much care to pursue at this point, between the time that the proposals were submitted and the time that the boards were appointed was a period of at least five months, if not longer than that. We were appointed in December and that report was complete in March—in fact, it first came out in February, as I recall. It caused a great deal of furor—well, less furor than people thought it would. I remember we took great precautions

on the Faculty Senate that it would not be released to the press until it was presented to the University, and nobody found it wildly terrifying or anything of the sort.

But the decision was made somewhere up there in the administrative heaven that we should have two boards on this campus instead of one. And I was appointed to the board in December, with great hopes and a little bit of lobbying to see that Cecelia St. John would take the chairmanship once again, she having worked with it for two and a half years and having a great deal of experience. And I did some arm twisting so that the first thing we did when we met as a board was to nominate Cecelia, who refused [laughs]. And so there I was. Ken Carpenter also refused, thinking it would not be suitable for a man, even though he had been involved with the original report, and probably knows more about the complications of athletics

*Faculty Senate Athletic Program Study Committee

than anybody who is not in athletics on this campus.

So by default, I ended up as chairman. It's a board made up of students and faculty and alumni representatives, and I have to say for it that it's the most generally ardent board I've seen in a long time. Everybody comes to meetings. We have problems, of course, with timing, but inasmuch as possible, practically everybody shows up for every meeting. We find no time at which we can all meet, so alternately certain people are absent. If we have Wednesday meetings some people miss it, if we have Thursday meetings other people miss it, so we take turns.

We're charged rather peculiarly with running the women's athletic program. And it's important, I think, to mention here that changes have been made in that program as a result of a long series of complicated personnel matters. This board finds itself in a different position from what it would have been had it been appointed a year before.

After several years (and this is a difficult matter to get started into for fear we'll get lost there and never get out again), after several years of difficulty in the women's physical education department, last spring, things came to a head, and the director of women's athletics, Luella Lilly, was told that she would be fired in the next year. The complications of this story are many, but essentially the problem was that there were limited facilities and limited funds. The men's program was fairly well established, the women's program was not. And although we have to admit that the Department of Physical Education, which has a sexless title, had hired Dr. Lilly to be Director of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, they really didn't want to support a program, and, essentially, every time she asked for something, it was interpreted as being a matter of "causing trouble." But at any

rate, whatever the reasons (and this is far too complex to go into here) she appealed, and in the process of hearing that appeal in a number of ways, the decision was made to give her back her job but to remove her from the Physical Education Department, at least on paper [laughing]. We can't do this physically, but on paper she would be removed and would report directly to the president. Now, this is not entirely a personnel matter, because the same sort of thing happened with men's athletics, but the programs are so different that it's very difficult to look at them in the same way.

However, there are certain advantages to this. It is no longer [a question of Dr. Lilly's] being the sole woman interested in women's athletics in the P.E. Department. There are very few women in the P.E. Department, and this is a result of a combination of circumstances. Most of all, the big money squeeze in 1971, at which time the University found itself with a short budget and with the awareness that it had to cut things. Now, what seemed to be the easiest way to cut staff was to say, "We will simply not fill those positions that all vacant. That way, we will not have to fire people."

Well, by sheer chance it happened that two or three women—not entirely by chance; I'll come to that later—in the Physical Education Department had resigned, and by the rules of the game it meant that those positions were not filled by other women. And the number of women in P.E. went down to a total of three full-time. I think it was at that time, because at that point Dr. Ruth Russell, who'd been there for many years was working for the Medical School in some sort of therapy program.

Well, that meant that women in the P.E. Department, which by now had become quite overpopulated with the coaches who'd been fired but who had tenure and who

remained there in the Physical Education Department, proportions seemed to get out of line. And it was very difficult for the women to get anything done. So this change of status was a very good thing. The only difficulty was that it makes the board that runs the Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Program and the board that runs the Men's Intercollegiate Athletic Program unlike any other board on campus, really, in that we are charged with budget, we are charged with personnel policy, we're charged with all kinds of administrative responsibilities in a way, policy making decisions, which other boards really don't do. And although we recognize that we're essentially advisory, we also are in a kind of no man's land as far as our functions are concerned, which was a terrible blow to somebody like me who has only watched the budget from the far beyond and has never been involved with any of this budgeting matter.

More than that, we were not named until exceedingly late in the year. It's difficult for people to remember that budgets are always way, way ahead of time. When we went to work in *December*, we discovered that we had deadlines in December for some items within weeks of the time that we were first gathered together. And this was practically at the Christmas break. As a matter of fact, I suspect we're the only board on campus that met the afternoon of the last day before Christmas vacation, and met for quite a while because it was the only way we could solve some of our problems.

We still meet a great deal, but we find ourselves in a rather strange position. We recently met with the men's board, which is part of our obligation. We have a little note that says at least once a year the two boards shall meet together and see if they think they ought to be one board. And the more we see

of it, the more we don't want this to happen because the two programs are so very, very different that this is always going to be a problem.

[The] men's athletics [programs] have been around ever since the University started. I mean it is an ancient tradition on the campus. Money has poured into it forever and ever and it is one of the accepted parts of campus life, whereas women's athletics, in the sense that we are talking about them, are a very recent development, at least in this part of the country. (There are places where women's athletics have counted for years but certainly not on a coeducational campus like ours.)

So it's almost like David and Goliath, I guess, except you have no sexist version of this that will work properly. The men's board has for a long time been supported by a program that is truly massive. I think that the figures run between a quarter and a half million dollars, expended at this university, every year, on men's athletics. Well, this is part of the tradition of a university, and I'm not about to comment in detail about how I feel about this except that I've always felt there were better places to put money, and that if athletics were to be called amateur they should be amateur. I have a lot of objections to things that go on in college athletics, but then so does everybody. It must have been close to thirty—or more than thirty—years ago when the University of Chicago said it wasn't going to play ball anymore, which is the first time anybody took a stand like that. But there have been a lot of changes since then.

Our campus has gone through periods, I gather, in which we went out and bought our share of athletes, and to a degree, I think, most of male athletics is not an [jokingly] amateur affair. It is a fact on this campus that eighty percent or perhaps even more of waivers of

tuition, which is to say scholarships, go to athletics, to men's athletics. Which means that of all this money— some of it goes to music, which is interesting. Very little of it goes to the general student body. Most of the scholarships that other students get come from some other source. It's a big program, always has been, and is so involved with the community that we don't really fit into the same kind of picture.

But the women's athletic program has produced some difficulties. One of the first ways that the problems with women athletes came to view was the fact that they did very well at some of the things which they did. And when for a couple of years we had gymnasts who came very close to titles in certain fields, somebody said, "Hey, women athletes?" Oh, yeah, yeah, they could accept women in certain fields. In skiing, we had some good skiers at one time, even though they never had organized skiing. And the gymnasts, particularly, did well. And, of course, Dr. Lilly had been charged to organize a program and she had begun to organize a program. But she ran into all kinds of peculiar things, like, "You can't use the gym now. I don't want to play with you around here." And the "limited facilities" appeared.

The problem of women's athletics was taken up by a number of groups on campus— very few, very concerned. Women's Athletics Board has existed for a long time; not a great many years, but it has been around for awhile, and essentially helped in an advisory capacity, generally.

But there were other events on campus that caused interest. Number one, the flurry of interest that arises on any campus when the words *affirmative action* [are] spoken. I think probably the first stirring of the "slave population"—I'm sorry [laughing]—you can put that in quotes, I suppose—came when a commission on the status of women was

formed. It was rather peculiar commission; a lot of us felt that it had very few of the women that had ever complained about the status of women on the campus. But it worked hard its first year and it came up with an affirmative action statement.

Just about the same time—I have always called it the loosest organization on campus, which I suppose makes us loose women—the Faculty Women's Caucus got started in a rather peculiar fashion, which was simply a matter of one faculty woman saying to another, "Hey, I wonder if we have anything in common; there aren't very many of us around." And so a meeting was called and the Faculty Women's Caucus was founded, as much as it got founded. It has probably the campus's shortest constitution and least complicated structure and most open membership. Anybody who wants to come is welcome, male or female. We haven't had very many men interested. But essentially its purpose was to bring into a group those women that weren't already covered by clerical council or student organizations. But in fact, it has included all kinds of women. And one of the very first interests of the Faculty Women's Caucus was the state of the women's athletic program. A number of events came together to make this work, though. At the same time that the women began to be concerned about the women's program, the affirmative action statement was required. And the faculty senate embarked on an investigation of the intercollegiate athletic program.

Now, this investigation deserves some attention, because whenever you say *investigation*, you have the feeling that somebody is out to get somebody's scalp. Yet this investigation started, in a lot of ways, for the benefit of athletes, because some of us felt that athletes were not getting a fair shake on this campus. I was not on the senate at that

time, but I remember being particularly happy about something coming up, for the simple reason that I had had students in my classes who had told me some very sad tales about their lives as athletes. One of these was a big black basketball player, who really burned my ear with tales of how these boys were put into the easiest possible courses with the lightest possible loads that didn't necessarily add up to any kind of academic program, because the intention for getting them here was simply to get them to play ball and there was not a real concern with getting them through school. If they got through school, it was incidental. But it never bothered the people who seemed to be in charge to say, "Okay, you've used up your eligibility. Good-bye." And sometimes the kids with poor advisement—and a lot of them coming from backgrounds in which they were not prepared to go to college—found that they had spent three years playing their hearts out and that they no longer had any support and that they weren't really anywhere academically, either. Now, for some of them this was all right; they had other interests. But [for] a lot of them who sincerely took the athletic scholarship for what it is best for, which is sending someone to college who wants to go to college, it was a great disappointment.

I remember I just recently got the *Alumnus* magazine from the University of New Mexico, where I used to teach, which had a wide spread on the first athlete I remember encountering who really wanted a college education. He's now working on his Ph.D. in education, but at the time, he was a kid out of a vocational high school who had been spotted while he was in the service as a runner. And I remember that the year I had him in a remedial English class he worked hard, very hard, and told me how happy he was to be in

college, that his running had finally gotten him into something that was worthwhile. And then, [he] was gone the last two weeks of school and could not pass the final. Track meet, track meet, track meet. All right, this is part of his deal, but he was so frustrated when he said, "I know I can't afford to miss class, but I also can't afford to get thrown off the track team." And he later went on to be a world record holder, for that matter. But he did get the courage to go back to school when he'd used up his eligibility and to finish off.

But these problems exist. And I'm in favor of any sort of scholarship that will give a person a chance to go to college who doesn't otherwise have a chance. Yet, there were lots of things going on over there [in athletics]. If a student got injured, what do we do with this person? Do we say, "all right, we liked you when you were healthy, but we don't care for you anymore. Now that you have gotten damaged in the service of the school, why, we will drop your scholarship because you're not playing football for us"—or baseball—or whatever it was? And so it was investigated and they found out a lot of things that they didn't like. And the idea was to reorganize the program. And that's how we came to be.

But I think it's a combination of things that have made women's athletics get into a situation where things look pretty good at this point. For years, women's athletics has had a different attitude towards the world than men's athletics has had. I think the most obvious example, which I've talked about just now, is the question of scholarships. Until recently no women's school gave scholarships, consistently, just for women's sports. It was considered that these were amateur sports. I mean, the girl went to college and if she wanted to engage in intercollegiate activities, that was on the side, which seems to me the way it should be.

There've always been some. I had a friend back in the '50's who had spent a year at some college in Florida on a fencing scholarship. But that was a male and female sort of thing and rather a peculiar thing, too, to have existed, except this school considered itself the fencing king of the southeast, or Florida, or wherever it was.

But women's athletics has always been considerably more amateur. There are definite limitations on the numbers of games. And as we know, there's no need for women's athletics to feed women into professional women's sports. Women's professional sports are all individual sports. Swimming catches a woman very, very young; you're worn out by the time you're 18 as a competitive swimmer, so the story goes. Tennis, [an] individual sport that has never been heavily played with women schools, not until recently. Golf—but women's team sports, no, you don't see them about the only time you used to see women—lady wrestlers on the television, and you used to see roller derbies and things of this sort. Competitive women's sports are really individual sports, which are less likely to require college backing. Yet, girls interested in competitive sports—and they can be fun, they're raised on these in school, we require them to take P.E., and then when they get to college, we sort of cut them off. In fact, at this school we dropped the P.E. requirement, although it didn't cut the P.E. classes a great deal because that became optional.

Women's sports have greater limitations. It [our conference] does not allow the kind of support that men's sports have had. Perhaps they've learned, because women's athletics have developed later than men's and they've seen the faults of letting yourself be carried over the hill with commercialism. Recruiting, for example, is specifically forbidden; none of this is allowed. Fancy uniforms and all the

backup—none of this has ever existed. But the problem at the University of Nevada was that we were more amateur than we really wanted to be.

The women had—which they had sought—a distribution of the student athletic fee, which was fifty cents out of seven-fifty. That sounds ludicrous, but at the time it sounded like a very good idea to get fifty cents, because there hadn't been any money before except what could be pulled out. Now, it seems to me amazing that fifty cents out of seven dollars should ever have been acceptable to anybody (except that I understand that when there's nothing, even a tiny bite seems quite worthwhile). Of course, women's athletics does not always have the same kind of support from a physical education department that men's athletics does. And this is something we're familiar with. It does not have a boosters club that has existed for ninety years and is ready to support everything in sight.

So when women here did begin to organize and began to play team sports, they did it the way that it would work. The girls bought their own uniforms, they supplied an awful lot of their own equipment, it would never have occurred to them to get the services of certain specialized sort of people. Intriguingly, for example, they paid for their own insurance. Any sport leads to the possibility of injury. If you've ever watched gymnastics, I'm astounded at the possibilities— scares the wits out of me to even think of getting up and doing some of those things—which, by the way, is a sport that is about the same for men and women. And the girls accepted this because they were interested in competing.

When the men's football [or] basketball team goes on tour, it hops into an airplane quite frequently, stays at a fine hotel, with two people in a room, and they then get ten dollars a day to eat on. Sounds decent enough; that's

about in keeping with what we say it costs a person to go. For the girls, the allowance—if there was one—was something like three dollars for a room, which means a Motel 6 with lots of people there; five dollars a day for food, and sometimes as little as three dollars a day for food, which meant that somebody packed a great big brown bag. And when we travel, we travel in station wagons, and that means six or eight or ten people in a station wagon and a minimum of things. It means that a lot of times the girls' teams slept on the floor in somebody's gym. You carried your sleeping bag.

Well, all right, they enjoyed it, they got a lot out of it, but it isn't right and it isn't fair and it isn't equitable. And essentially what we tried to do was to give the women's program a fair distribution, for girls that wanted to do things and they should have had the opportunity to do them. We have about, oh, a distribution in our student body of, say, forty percent women and sixty percent men. And as we all know, intercollegiate athletics has never included the entire male student body, neither does women's. But proportions are really quite peculiar there. Vast sums of money have always been poured into men's athletics and not into women's. And the women have tried to get—no one has asked for an equal distribution or a proportionate share, although I think this is something we may have to come to. But it is also true that we couldn't use that much money if we had it because we don't have that big a program. The important thing is that we should have enough money to fund a program that the girls can enjoy and get into.

Well, for example, they originally had planned, when they expanded them, for the next two years—it's hard to think that far ahead—had intended to have a skiing program. And they discovered that more

girls were interested in swimming than were interested in skiing. Now, swimming's been very difficult on this campus, because we've never had a pool. Even our swimming classes have been taught off campus at the Y pool and at the Moana pool. So it's never been a big deal. But with a pool on campus, it seemed ridiculous not to have a swimming team.

And this demonstrates, I think, some of the problems that the athletic program has had. We have, for example, in this city, two very well organized programs for children up through high school. We have an excellent tennis program. We have an excellent swimming program—[the] swimming program isn't quite so large, but it is very enthusiastically attended. The YMCA and the Sparks group and other groups—there have always been at least two or three swim clubs in this town training kids and getting them interested in sports, with the idea that eventually they might go on if they're seriously interested. The same's true with the tennis program; we have one of the best tennis programs around. It's all over town. It's practically free. It appeals to all kinds of people. But what happens to a girl when she swims for the Y for a number of years, or she plays tennis in a city program, and she gets to college and she can't even compete because there isn't any program set up for her?

So part of the women's program has been an effort to accommodate those sports which seem to be of interest. And when extra sports were added, the effort was to add those that people were interested in. They've added swimming and tennis which will come up. Essentially, what Dr. Lilly has done is find out what the girls are interested in. It seems when one has very little money and some of the money is quite limited, that to buy a coach who will coach a sport which will involve thirty girls, makes better sense than

to get a coach who will coach a sport which may involve three, which may be the case with some of these fields. So this has been the understanding. And it has also been settled by votes; girls who were interested in athletics have voted for the sports that they wanted.

Our girls seem to get a great deal out of the program, and it seems only right that it should be there. But the money has always been a serious problem. I think you see something about it when you stop and consider that the women's athletic program, right now, with its new fee (which I'll talk about in a moment) will still operate on less than the salary of Las Vegas's one basketball coach. But then, a lot is less than that! For example, we were hiring an Olympic gymnastics coach—a woman who had coached an Olympic team. She was that good. And we were paying her \$600 to coach our quite good team on a part-time contract, whereas a part-time football coach—and this is number one, two, three, somewhere down about number three or four on the line—a part-time football coach for the short period for men's athletics was being paid \$6,000 a year, for a half-time job. Now, that just isn't right, but that's the way things go.

Now, we have worked with trying to get money and we have had some cooperation, I think, from Acting President Anderson, who has tried very hard. It's very difficult to know whether people are cooperating at this point or whether they're scared. And this is part of the difficulty with any of the women's things. It is true that federal action has, to some degree, frightened a lot of people. The terror of having Health, Education, and Welfare come in and say, "You are not treating your women right, we are going to cut off your federal funds," is a very real terror because, as we discovered in budget crisis of last year, this campus is very firmly involved with federal money. It's a good weapon and I'm very glad we have it, but I'm

also uncertain many times whether certain things are being granted to us because we have a good cause and people understand the cause, or whether they're afraid that someone is going to sue. And it's very difficult to ask for things without feeling as if you're threatening. You say, "Look, affirmative action exists, you better do something about this." Just one of the reasons that almost the only action that our combined boards took last time when they met together, (which we did a couple of weeks ago) was to say, "We think it's important that the University get a balanced program going." We didn't say a 50-50 program, or a 40-60 program, or a \$200,000 for you or \$300,000 for me, but a *balanced program*, so that we don't end up with a ridiculous circumstance.

And the cooperation has been along the lines, "Well, we'd really like to help you but we don't know how much we can," except I think that the administration has recognized that it's going to help us, help us in some way or another, whether we yell for it or not, or we may end up in very bad shape.

Well, the other source for funds—and one of the most ridiculous things—has been the student fee, which was proposed a number of years ago and from which women's athletics has gotten fifty cents from each student's fee for a certain period of time. But about a year ago, it was suggested that the fee be raised or that the fee be split differently. Now this is probably the most blatant denial of fair and equal treatment that could possibly exist. The fee is paid by all full-time students, male and female, and it is not used fairly. A lot of other things may be raised, but this is our softest point.

I think there's no question that if she could afford it, a girl could bring suit against this campus—and there has been one brewing in the making—and get judicial action on the basis of this discriminatory fee because it is

a very difficult matter. The American Civil Liberties Union is backing a plan to bring [suit] if things can't be arranged otherwise. Now, it's not that this is an empty threat, it's that it's an expensive and slow process, the reason that no suit has been brought. And also, because I think on campus there's an earnest desire on the part of the women who are there to try and settle matters, to try to improve their lot without resorting to legal action, because we know how crippling it could be.

We have no desire to bring all federal funds to a stop here. We understand that the good of the campus depends on them. But, on the other hand, we cannot be put off forever, and women's athletics is just part of this. The students defeated the fee when it was first proposed and said, no, they didn't want to give that much. It was brought up again in another two weeks, and the climate had changed to the degree that the disagreement was over whether they should give us an extra dollar and a half on top of the current [amount] or whether they should split the fee down the middle, and give us half of it. But, essentially, what finally passed was an addition of a dollar—well, they raised the fee by two dollars. And now two dollars goes to women and fifty cents goes to something else—the fifty cents we used to have and a dollar and a half increase, which still leaves us in the hole.

It was intriguing to see what happened when Lou Lilly took her budget and put it on the same level as the men. We really felt that if a person represented his school he deserved enough to eat and a good place to stay. Now, admittedly, it's nice to save money once in a while in the school, but we didn't see why the women should have to do all the saving. (Although, by the way, we discovered that it's not only men's athletics and women's athletics

that are uneven, but there's a difference in men's athletics between popular money sports and minor sports. The track men are supposed to be able to get by on less than football players and basketball players. If a man plays a minor sport, baseball and track, particularly are the ones—and it's interesting that track is one of the sports in which this University has done quite well. We have some national records, particularly in cross-country, with our distance runners, and yet this is a minor sport. Now, perhaps it's argued that because they don't get that much, maybe they work for other reasons than the pay that they get out of it. I shouldn't say *pay*, but we know what we mean by pay—compensation.) But the whole money situation is a very, very confused one—doubling up, giving these prices, doing the things that men's teams have always taken for granted, does make the budget look pretty terrifying.

More than that, the new facility has presented another pile of problems which I hope will be resolved. But the theory has been that the old gym would be occupied by intercollegiate athletics, men's intercollegiate athletics. And the new facility, which is called a *recreation building* (we mustn't call it a gymnasium, it's a recreation building), was supposed to be recreation for students and physical education. It has two big gyms, and it has a diving pool and a swimming pool, and it has a lot of other things. It has been cut back, too; and when it was cut back, a lot of the things that might have made the equal program also disappeared. Surprisingly, the men's training rooms survived, but the women's training room disappeared. And the building itself leaves a great deal to be desired in terms of planning. But this is, of course, something that this University seems to be good at; I don't know how many buildings we have that anybody's happy with within two

years after they're built, or sometimes even before. But these are, again, related— who practices where and when? and how much of the space do these people get? And our board's feeling has been that it's time that we give the women a fair shake. We've tried everything that we know to even them out.

We have [a] fund raising event, by the way, coming up. And, incidentally, we've gotten a lot more interest in women's athletics than there used to be. We felt that our board was not there to raise funds, and the girls simply asked the Faculty Wives Club if they'd help them, and the Faculty Wives Club has rallied 'round and offered people who have the kind of experience to help plan this. There will be a fund raising event May 4, to try to give some money to the girls' program which is badly behind. Now, exactly what it's used for, it doesn't matter a great deal. There are so many things that are missing there—simple things like awards. We all have watched men walking around with letters. These are things the women's program have seldom been able to afford. And yet there're certain reasons that a person wants to represent his school and wants to be known as a person representing his—her— school [laughs] (I'm in the masculine habit). But I don't know, things look as if they might change. As I said, we're very new and it's very difficult to pick out where we might go and how much of this is really going to work.

We have the feeling that we could bang on the table, but we don't really want to do that, because I like to look at the long term. I expect to be around this school for another fifteen, twenty years before I quit. I mean, this is where I intend to stay. And I can't think what it would be like if I should spend ten of those years being looked at by my fellow faculty members as, "*There's one of the ones—remember when the funds quit?*" I don't care

to get things that way. I'd rather have it be recognized that affirmative action does exist, and that we need to be fair, and that we can do it on our own without having to have a federal stick held over our heads. It will work much better for the women on campus. (I'm quite selfish about this.) I think we'll be better off if it can be settled in such a manner that we don't have a fight about it.

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

Academic Council, 133, 294,
300, 301, 303, 304, 306
Academic freedom, 67-68, 71,
482. *See also* Tenure
Academic Standards Committee,
130-132, 134
Affirmative Action policies,
164, 224, 258-259, 292,
313, 493, 504
Albright, Laurie, 5
Alden, Mark, 39
Allen, Judd, 453
Alumni Association, 1-62,
111, 246-247, 421-422,
429-430
Alumni News, 7-8, 20n,
33, 38, 42-44
Amadeus Quartet, 337-338
American Association of
University Professors,
63-97, 191, 214-215
American Civil Liberties
Union, 506
American Federation of
Teachers, 70, 72-73,
91, 92
Anderson, Fred M., 18,
192, 457
Anderson, James T., 41,
103, 117-118, 119-120,
127-129, 175, 176, 230,
251, 252, 260, 294-295,
296, 299-300, 301,
302-303, 304, 305, 307,
308, 313, 453, 504
Annual giving drive
(Alumni association),
6, 24, 42. *See also*
Morrill Hall
Archives, University, 460,
461, 465
Armstrong, Charles,
457-458, 474
Artemisia, 100, 101
Arts Festival, 342

A

Associated Students of
the University of
Nevada, 34, 36, 98-174,
328, 341, 364, 422
Associated Students,
University of Nevada,
Constitution, 98
Associated Students,
University of Nevada,
Senate, 98, 116-117
Athletics, 140-155, 385,
485-510
Atkinson, Glen, 226

B

Baepler, Donald, 175,
199-200, 269, 270
Baleson, Mel M., 147-149
Barnes, Roberta, 453
Basta, Samuel M., 9, 417-456
Bell Telephone Company,
Nevada, 438
Benezet, Louis T., 286-287
Bible, Alan, 18
Binder, Fred, 267-268
Black students, 100, 494-495
Bohmont, Dale W., 119, 120,
295, 299-300, 301, 307-308
Booth, Roscoe, 341
Borodin String Quartet, 339
Brasfield, Thomas, 5
Brown, Harold N., 420, 427,
453
Brown, Steve, 48
Buchanan, James L. "Bucky,"
316
Bushnell, Eleanor, 452

C

Cady, Nicholas M., 466
Cain, Edmund, 129-130
Calendar, University, 132-133
Caples, Robert Cole, 13-14

C

Carnegie Commission on
Higher Education, 140,
180, 192
Carpenter, Kenneth J.,
327, 486
Caudle, Sheila, 370
Cecich, Don, 110, 116-117,
121, 247, 255, 282,
315b, 315c. *See also*
Presidential Search
Committee
Centennial celebration,
8, 9-10, 11, 13-14, 40,
42, 45, 52, 61, 93,
417-456, 475-477. *See*
also University of
Nevada, A Centennial
History
Chamber of Commerce,
Reno, 433
Chancellor, UNS, 104, 105,
106, 108, 109, 114,
121-122, 161, 173, 218,
230, 254, 323-324. *See*
also Neil D. Humphrey
Chronicle of Higher
Education, 258, 260,
262, 275, 276
Clark, Walter Van Tilburg,
15, 16
Collective bargaining,
faculty, 68-77, 92,
191-192, 210, 215-216,
217, 219-220, 226-227,
482-483. *See also Tenure*
Collins, Robert O., 293, 294
Community College Division
(UNS), 89-91, 198-199,
211, 227, 469
Concentus Musicus, 338
Consolidated Students,
University of Nevada
(CSUN) (Las Vegas),
103-104, 105, 108,
109, 111. *See also*
University of Nevada,
Las Vegas

C

Cook, Jack 454
Crumley, Frances S., 27
Cufflin, Crispian, 99

D

Deller Consort, 337
Del Papa, Frankie Sue, 140
Delta Sigma Pi (business
fraternity), 164-169,
173
Desert Research Institute
(DRI), 222, 468, 471
Diamond, Robert, 341
Dickstein, Martin, 327-344
Dormitories, 155-156,
158-163, 188-190
Douglass, Pat, 27
Driggs, Don W., 120, 122,
125, 241-326. *See also*
Presidential Search
Committee
Duffy, Katherine, 169

E

Early Music Consort of
London, 339-340
Earnhart, George T., 239
Elliott, Russell R., 427,
452, 458-459
Elmore, Richard "Rick,"
140, 164, 170
Enos, Gladys, 101, 102
Enrollment, student,
177-178
Essa, Ahmed, 383, 466
Evaluation of faculty,
81-88, 205-208

F

Faculty governance, 69-70.
See also Faculty Senate

F

Faculty Senate, UNR, 47,
48, 63, 69, 75, 95, 114,
115, 134, 212, 213, 214,
228, 229-230, 242, 243,
245, 246, 247-250, 254,
273, 275, 485-486
Faculty Wives Club, 509
Faculty Women's Caucus,
493-494
Farrens, Paul, 39
Ferguson, Neal, 341
Flack, JoDeen, 115, 242,
250, 254, 271, 273-275,
300. *See also* Faculty
Senate, UNR
Fladager, Pat, 247, 257,
299, 315c-316, 317b,
317c, 318, 453. *See
also* Presidential
Search Committee
Fontera, Iris, 317-317a
Fontera, Richard, 120a,
120b, 122, 289-292,
294, 309, 309a, 309b,
309c, 310-314, 315,
315a-315c, 316, 317,
317b-317c, 318,
324-325
Food services, 156-158,
159, 189
Foreign language requirement,
124, 136-140
Frank, Buddy, 345-346, 347
Franklin Mint, 14

G

Gerth, Beverly, 317
Gerth, Don, 120a, 122, 263,
282, 293, 309, 309a, 309b,
309c, 309d, 309f, 310,
315, 315c, 318
Gezelin, Emile, 189
Glass, Mary Ellen, 125, 248,
257, 258, 259, 264, 307,
315a, 317, 317a, 319.
See also Presidential
Search Committee

G

Goodman-Malamuth, Leo,
281-282, 293
Gorrell, Robert M., 137,
138, 253, 295-296
Graduate Students
Association (GSA), 341
Grateful Dead, the, 112
Gray, Leslie B., 15-16
Grisillo, Glenn, 147-148
Grotegut, Eugene K., 138,
231, 244, 247-248

H

Halberstadt, William H.,
341
Hall, Thomas J., 37
Harder, Kelsie, 101,
345-416. *See also
Sagebrush*
Harrington, John, 239
Harris, Everett B., 420,
453
Havas, Paul, 5, 34, 453
Health, Education, and
Welfare, U. S. Depart-
ment (HEW), 167, 168,
504
Heidtman, Agnes, 277
Hettich, David, 342
Highway Department,
Nevada state, 437
Holbrook, Hal, 337
Homecoming, 1974, 4, 7
Howard, Anne, 383,
385-386, 485-510
Hudson, Beverly, 6
Hug, Procter R., Jr.,
111, 173
Hulse, James Warren, 8,
244, 245, 327, 424,
433-434, 457-484
Humphrey, Neil D., 242,
266-267, 268-275, 277,
305, 309c, 309d, 309e,
311, 312-313, 317, 317a,
317b-317c, 324-325, 332,
360, 464

I

Institutional Studies
and Budget Committee,
230-232
"In White America," 337
Irwin, Ralph A., 420-421,
453
Israeli Trio, 338-339

J

Jacobsen, Harold, 172, 173,
175-209, 232, 233, 234-236,
239, 267-268, 315, 316.
See also Board of Regents
Jessup, Kenneth Donald, 230
Joyce, Nedra, 239, 313, 314

K

Keeler, Carl, 159-160, 162
Kees, Sally, 248-249, 255,
259, 282, 315c, 319. *See also*
Presidential Search
Committee
Kerr, Clark, 139-140
Kersey, Robert L., 453
Kipnis, Igor, 337, 338
Klaich, Daniel, 140
Klatt, Edward C., 130, 131
Knudtsen, Molly, 238
Kohn, Joseph, 239-240,
314-315
Kosso, Lenore, 461-462

L

Laine, Mike, 159
Laird, Charlton, 327, 420,
427, 453
Landini, Richard, 309, 309a
Larsen, Larry, 452
Laughter, Robert, 149, 153
Lauri, Nick, 13, 14, 19
Laxalt, Robert, 464
Lee, Keith, 5
Legislature, Nevada State,
37-38, 74-75, 77-78,
471-472

L

Lenox String Quartet, 338
Leonard, Paul, 453
Library, UNR, 218-219
Lilly, Luella, 149, 152,
383, 487-488, 492, 503,
507. *See also* Athletics
Lingenfelter, C. W.
"Corky," 48, 247
Loeffler, Linda, 428
Lombardi, Louis, 238-239,
316
Loper, Keith, 143

Mc

McAuliffe, Jack, 11, 452
McDonald, Janet, 104, 105
McKee, Robert, 249, 256-258,
282, 293, 309f, 315, 322,
324. *See also* Presidential
Search Committee

M

Magney, Mark, 143
Malfalcon, Clinton, 146
"Mark Twain Tonight," 337
Marshall, Rita, 45
Martin, Wayne, 341
Martinez, Edward, 341
Mayer, Tom, 453
Medical Sciences, School of,
96
Melcher, Joseph F., 6
Menicucci, Jeff, 363
Milam, Max, 50, 120a, 120b,
121, 122-123, 199,
200-201, 261, 282, 293,
309, 309a, 309g-310, 315,
315c, 317, 317a, 317b,
317c, 318-321
Millard, Marianne, 453
Miller, N. Edd, 14, 102-103,
142, 143, 148, 175-176,
213, 241-242, 251, 252,
253, 303, 333, 339, 396,
415, 417, 459, 460, 476
Monat, William, 285, 286

M

Morgan, Richard, 191, 216
 Morgan, Shirley, 162
 Morrill Hall, 9, 10-26,
 40-41, 100-101, 349,
 350-352, 367, 430
 Morris, William
 "Wildcat," 111, 239,
 316, 374
 Murphy, Charles, 43
 Murphy, Joseph S.,
 283-286, 292, 294,
 308-309, 309a, 309b-309c,
 309f
 Myers, Dennis, 359

N

Nash, Judy Morrison, 5,
 48-49, 246, 247, 255,
 257, 259, 315a-315b.
 See also Presidential
 Search Committee
 Nash, Rusty, 27
 National Council for the
 Preservation of Historic
 Places, 19-20. *See also*
 Morrill Hall
 National Education
 Association, 70, 73
 National Society of
 Professors, 63, 70, 75,
 91, 92, 94-95, 191,
 210-240, 244, 249, 482
 National Student Lobby, 168
 Negroes, 258, 259. *See also*
 Black students
 Nemenoff and Luboshutz, 337
 Nevada State Employees
 Association (NSEA),
 190-191, 210-211, 216, 217,
 221, 237. *See also* National
 Society of Professors
 Nevada State Fair, 428-429
 Newell, Lee, 153
 New York Brass Quintet, 339
 Nuwer, Henry J. "Hank," 356,
 358, 360-361, 369, 370,
 374-375, 383, 407

O

O'Brien, Thomas D., 118,
 124, 246, 247, 253, 257,
 258, 281-282, 283, 293,
 298, 301, 304-305, 308,
 309a, 315b-315c, 316,
 317a. *See also* Presidential
 Search Committee
 O'Driscoll, Pat, 361
 Ogden, Dan, 293
 Oliver, Clela, 46
 Olscamp, Paul, 288-289
 Olsen, Carole, 341
 Olsen, Edward A., 318-319,
 382-384, 421, 453
 Olsen, Marlene, 358, 361,
 380

P

Padgett, James, 147
 Pagni, Al, 27
 Parsons, Edward S., 10, 11
 Perriera, Pete, 99, 120a
 Petersen, Gerald W., 63-97
 Phillips, Virginia, 452
 Pine, Edward L., 156, 162,
 420, 453
 Potter, Donald G., 424
 Pozzi, Archie, 234
 Presidential Search Committee,
 5, 47-50, 110, 113-126,
 147, 176-177, 212-213,
 227-229, 241-326, 473, 475
 Press, University of Nevada,
 427, 468
 "Project Ask," 34-35
 Public Occasions Board,
 327-344
 Puffer, Merle E. "Ted," 342

Q

Quintetto Boccherini, 337

R

Ragland, Jeanette, 453

R

Regents, Board of, 12, 36,
103, 105, 106, 109, 110,
111, 121, 175-209, 220,
233, 236, 237-240, 241,
242, 264-265, 267-268,
280, 307, 309f, 313-316,
321, 325, 370, 372-374,
457, 458
Reno Evening Gazette, 372,
374-375
Reynolds, Augusta Lillian,
16-18
Reynolds, Terry, 34, 36,
98-174, 246, 247, 264,
299, 304, 309f, 315,
326, 349, 350, 351,
371, 453-454. *See also*
ASUN, Presidential Search
Committee, Student
government
Richardson, James T., 210-240,
244, 248-249, 254, 271, 273.
See also National Society
of Professors
Risser, Arthur C., Jr., 164
Ritenhouse, John, 341
Robertson, Joseph, 248
Rocky Mountain Press
Association, 390
Rosenberg, Howard, 419-420,
438
ROTC, 365, 366
Russell, David, 8, 9
Russell, Ruth I., 489

S

Sagebrush, 100, 101, 303,
345-416, 429
St. John, Cecelia, 5, 27,
486
Santini, Clark, 452
Scattini, Jerry, 147
Seufferle, Charles, 452
Sheppard, Craig, 428, 431
Shields, James C., 242, 243
Shipler, Guy, 234

S

Sierra Pacific Power
Company, 437-438
Sirotkin, Phillip, 287-288,
292, 309, 309a, 309b,
309c, 309d-309e, 309f
Smith, George T., 300, 306
Smith, Ron, 453
Snider, Merle, 342-343
Steninger, Mel, 158-159,
233, 238, 242, 317
Stewart Hall, 9, 435
Stoess, Alfred W., 231
Struve, Larry D., 1-62,
453. *See also* Alumni
Association
Stubbs, Joseph Edward,
474-475
Student government, 35-37,
105-106, 170-171, 173,
186-187, 372. *See also*
Associated Students,
University of Nevada
Consolidated Students,
University of Nevada
Terry Reynolds
Student services, 161, 162,
173. *See also* Dormitories,
Food services

T

Taylor, Alyce Savage, 27
Teacher Education Board, 129
Tenure, faculty, 39, 63-66,
71, 78-81, 178-185, 208,
232-234, 481-482, 483
Thomas, Patricia, 329,
340-341
Thompson, Helen, 239, 313
Tilley, Pat, 225
Tillim, Madge, 453
Tompson, Robert N., 244,
247, 248, 250-251,
252-254, 257, 258, 272,
279, 298, 305, 315c,
317, 319. *See also*
Presidential Search
Committee

T

Torvinen, Roy L., 18
Trachok, Richard, 142-150.
See also Athletics
Tucker, Thomas T., 249, 300
Tyler, Jack, 161-162

U

*University of Nevada,
A Centennial History,*
457-475
*University of Nevada,
Las Vegas (UNLV),*
185-187, 199-200,
208-209, 222, 224-225,
267-268, 269, 270,
271, 278-279. *See also*
Consolidated Students,
University of Nevada
(CSUN)
University Times, 43-44,
164, 232

W

Wade, Daniel M., 105, 109.
See also Consolidated
Students, University of
Nevada (CSUN)
Walevska, Christine, 337
Walker, Myneer, 27
Walsh, Daniel, 239
Webster, Beveridge, 338
Welch, William, 341
Wells, Charles V. "Tom,"
446
Wilcox, Allen, 231
Winkler, Larry, 356, 358,
361, 382
Wittenberg, Esthermae K.,
16-17
Wittenberg, Ralph K., 16-18
Wolf, Harry, 260
Wolfe, Hans, 6, 32, 34, 452

W

Women, 164-169, 222,
224-225, 485-510.
See also Affirmative
Action
Women's Equity Action
League, 167, 168
Women's Intercollegiate
Athletics Board,
485-510
Wooster, Earl, 453

Y

Young, Kenneth, 297-299
Young, Ralph, 249,
251-252, 264-265, 315b,
317b. *See also*
Presidential Search
Committee

Z

Zabaleta, Nicanor, 338

